The Gniezno Summit

The Religious Premises of the

Founding of the Archbishopric of Gniezno

◎

Roman Michałowski

BRILL

The Gniezno Summit

East Central and Eastern Europe in the Middle Ages, 450–1450

General Editor

Florin Curta

VOLUME 38

The Gniezno Summit

The Religious Premises of the Founding of the Archbishopric of Gniezno

By

Roman Michałowski

Translated by

Anna Kijak

Language editor for the translation

Richard John Butterwick-Pawlikowski

Cover illustration: Saint Adalbert of Prague, stone well at Saint Bartholomew Basilica, Rome, Tiber Island. © Photo M. B. Lenzi.

This book is printed on acid-free paper and produced in a sustainable manner.

Contents

List of Abbreviations

Adalberti Vita I	*Sancti Adalberti Pragensis episcopi et martyris Vita prior*. Edited by Jadwiga Karwasińska. *MPH* Nova series 4.1. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1962.
Adalberti Vita II	*Sancti Adalberti Pragensis episcopi et martyris Vita altera auctore Brunone Querfurtensi*. Edited by Jadwiga Karwasińska. MPH Nova series 4.2. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1969.
BHL	*Bibliotheca hagiographica latina antiquae et mediae aetatis*, ed. Socii Bollandiani, vol. 1–2, Bruxelles, 1989–1901; *Bibliotheca hagiographica latina antiquae et mediae aetatis*, wyd. Socii Bollandiani, Supplementi editio altera auctior, Bruxelles, 1911; *Bibliotheca hagiographica latina antiquae et mediae aetatis*, Novum supplementum, ed. H. Fros, Bruxelles, 1986.
DO I	*Diplomatum regum et imperatorum Germaniae Tomus I. Conradi I., Heinrici I. et Ottonis I diplomata*. Edited by Theodor Sickel. *MGH* Diplomata 1. Hannoverae-Lipsiae: Hahn, 1879–1911.
DO II	*Diplomatum regum et imperatorum Germaniae Tomi II. pars prior. Ottonis II. diplomata*. MGH Diplomata 2.1. Hannoverae: Hahn 1888.
DO III	*Diplomatum regum et imperatorum Germaniae Tomi II. pars posterior. Ottonis III. diplomata*. Edited by Theodor Sickel. MGH Diplomata 2.2. Hannoverae: Hahn 1893.
Gall	*Galli Anonymi Cronica et gesta ducum sive principum Polonorum*. Edited by Karol Maleczyński. *MPH* Nova series 2. Cracoviae: Polska Akademia Umiejętności, 1952.
Hariulf	Hariulf, *Chronique de l'Abbaye de Saint-Riquier*. Edited by Ferdinand Lot. Paris: Picard, 1894.
JE	Jaffé-Ewald, *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum*.
JK	Jaffé-Kaltenbrunner, *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum*.
JL	Jaffé-Löwenfeld, *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum*.
MGH	Monumenta Germaniae Historica.
MGH SS	Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Scriptores.
MPH	Monumenta Poloniae Historica

Papsturkunden   *Papsturkunden, 896–1046*. 3 vols. Edited by Harald Zim-
                     mermann. Österreichische Akademieder Wissenschaften,
                     Phil.-hist. Klasse, Denkschriften 174, 177, 198. Veröffentlic-
                     hungender Historischen Kommission 3, 4, 5. Vienna: Öster-
                     reichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1984, 1985, 1989.

PL   J.-P. Migne, *Patrologiae cursus completus. Series latina.*

Thietmar   *Thietmari Merseburgensis episcopi Chronicon*. Edited by
                     Robert Holtzmann. MGH SS rerum Germanicarum Nova
                     series 9. Berlin: Weidmann, 1935.

Vita b. Romualdi   *Petri Damiani Vita beati Romualdi*. Edited by Giovanni
                     Tabacco. Fonti per la storia d'Italia 94. Roma: Istituto
                     Storico Italiano per il Medio Evo, 1957.

Vita Richarii I   *Vita Richarii sacerdotis Centulensis primigenia*. Edited by
                     Bruno Krusch. MGH *Scriptores rerum Merovingicarum* 7,
                     444–453. Hannoverae-Lipsiae: Hahn, 1920.

Vita Richarii II   *Vita Richarii confessoris Centulensis auctore Alcuino*. Edited
                     by Bruno Krusch. MGH *Scriptores rerum Merovingicarum* 4,
                     389–401. Hannoverae-Lipsiae: Hahn, 1902.

Widukind   *Die Sachsengeschichte des Widukind non Korvei*. In *Quellen
                     zur Geschichte der sächsischen Kaiserzeit*. Edited by
                     Albert Bauer and Reinhold Rau. Ausgewählte Quellen zur
                     deutschen Geschichte des Mittelalters 8, 1–183. Darmstadt:
                     Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1971.

Introduction

The year 1000 or, to be more precise, the era which it symbolizes,[1] has proved to be a constant source of fascination for French historians for nearly 200 years. Initially, the source of their fascination lay in *les terreurs de l'an Mil*, the fear of the end of the world, which people allegedly felt at the turn of the millennium. Theologians living in late Antiquity and the early Middle Ages, guided by a rather vague passage from the Book of the Revelation (20:1–10), were inclined to believe that the second coming of Christ would happen one thousand years after his Birth (or Death and Resurrection),[2] Bearing this in mind, in the 19th century and later some historians closely studied sources from the 10th and 11th centuries, trying to find any traces of an apocalyptic mood. There were even medievalists claiming that people living at the turn of the millennium were convinced that doomsday was near and, as a result, became almost hysterical.[3]

Unlike their 19th-century predecessors, modern French historians usually reject such views, leaving the fascination with the "terrors of the year 1000" to their American and German colleagues. Nevertheless, the year 1000 has remained an important topic for French medievalists for more fundamental reasons than before. The discussion is now focused on the nature and speed of changes leading from the institutions of the Carolingian era to the institutions of the High Middle Ages.[4] According to one view, which was universally accepted until recently, around 1000 there came a profound breakthrough, which some even describe as a revolution: old, that is, Carolingian, socio-political institutions, based on the public authority of counts acting on behalf of the

---

1 A pan-European panorama of the century ending in 1000 has recently been presented in Henryk Samsonowicz, *"Długi wiek X". Z dziejów powstawania Europy*, Mała Biblioteka PTPN 8 (Poznań: Poznańskie Towarzystwo Przyjaciół Nauk, 2002). I should also mention a work which forty years ago provided an excellent summary of the state of research into the topic in question at the time: *L'Europe aux IXᵉ–XIᵉ siècles. Aux origines des Etats nationaux*, ed. Tadeusz Manteuffel and Aleksander Gieysztor (Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1968).

2 Richard Allen Landes, "Millenarismus absconditus: L'historiographie augustinienne et le millénarisme du Haut Moyen Age jusqu'en l'an Mil," *Le Moyen Age* 98 (1992): 355–377.

3 Among the vast literature on the subject, see e.g. Richard Allen Landes, *Relics, Apocalypse and the Deceits of History. Ademar of Chabannes 989–1034* (Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press, 1995); Sylvain Gougenheim, *Les fausses terreurs de l'an Mil* ([Paris]: Picard, 1999).

4 Christian Lauranson-Rosaz, "Le débat sur la 'mutation féodale': état de la question," in *Europe around the Year 1000*, ed. Przemysław Urbańczyk (Warsaw: Wydawnictwo DiG, 2001), 11–40.

king, disintegrated completely and were replaced by feudal relations, that is, ties governed by private law. However, today this concept is firmly rejected by some scholars. They believe that there was no radical breakthrough at the time; at most we can speak of a slow evolution. In addition, it is doubtful whether changes were indeed as profound as some researchers believe. Carolingian institutions might have been only slightly modified. The stakes in this dispute are high. Its results will determine whether one can talk of feudalism (in the classical meaning of the word) at all in the history of Europe.

Historians dealing with the history of Poland face no less important, albeit completely different questions. The 10th century was a period when tribal structures in the regions of the rivers Oder and Vistula River were becoming a thing of the past and were being replaced by a new type of political association. These processes led to the emergence of the Polish state. Socio-political transformations accompanied religious and cultural changes associated with the Christianization of the country. It is thus fully understandable that for Polish medievalists the year 1000 is a symbol of processes and events of the highest importance. We can even say that it is more than a symbol, given the fact that this was the year of the Summit of Gniezno, which represented a genuine closure of the first stage of the transformations. That is why the rich and varied literature dealing with the beginnings of the Piast state is full of articles and monographs devoted to the reconstruction and interpretation of the events in Gniezno. Their number has considerably increased in recent years, a phenomenon associated to a large extent with the celebrations of the anniversary of St. Adalbert's death (997) and the 1000th anniversary of the Congress.[5] The celebrations were all the more solemn given the fact that their significance was also political. The events from ten centuries back were seen as anticipating the contemporary unification of Europe—a process particularly important for statesmen and intellectual elites.

---

5   The latest findings are summed up in the following publications: *Ziemie polskie w X w. i ich znaczenie w kształtowaniu się nowej mapy Europy*, ed. Henryk Samsonowicz (Kraków: Universitas, 2000); Jerzy Strzelczyk, "Naukowe pokłosie śmierci św. Wojciecha," *Nasza Przeszłość* 98 (2002): 5–97; idem, "Naukowe pokłosie millenium zjazdu gnieźnieńskiego," *Roczniki Historyczne* 68 (2002): 157–174; Sławomir Gawlas, "Der hl. Adalbert als Landespatron und die frühe Nationenbildung bei den Polen," in *Polen und Deutschland vor 1000 Jahren. Die Berliner Tagung über den "Akt von Gnesen"*, ed. Michael Borgolte, Europa im Mittelalter. Abhandlungen und Beiträge zur historischen Komparatistik 5 (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 2002), 193–233; Gerard Labuda, "Posłowie," in idem, *Święty Wojciech biskup-męczennik. Patron Polski, Czech i Węgier*, 2nd edition (Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego 2004), 315–331.

Until recently, the year 1000 meant relatively little for German historians. It is true that the 10th century, during which the Saxon dynasty came to power, has been a favourite subject of German researchers from times immemorial. The reasons are obvious. The century in question was marked by the emergence of the rudiments of German statehood and the emergence of conditions in which the German nation could evolve in a very slow process lasting several centuries. However, scholars used to focus on the reigns of Henry I and Otto I, when new relations emerged for the first time. The reign of Otto III, when viewed from such a perspective, did not really matter. Moreover, medievalists analysing the past from a national(ist) point of view disliked this emperor.[6] They did not understand the principles guiding his actions, even claiming that Otto III's rule, had it lasted longer, would have caused considerable damage to the German *raison d'état*. The scholars were perplexed by the monarch's ascetic practices and regarded his Roman policy as dangerous, because it had not been based on a real balance of power. They were particularly irritated by his Polish policy, believing that it had broken with the principles set by Otto I, the only principles in keeping with the interests of the state and the nation. Such views were repeatedly voiced in the 19th century and in the first half of the 20th century, though similar opinions have also been expressed more recently.

The first successful attempt to abandon this way of thinking was made by Percy Ernst Schramm.[7] He tried to assess Otto III's rule not from the point of view of the German national interests, but by taking as his point of reference one of the great ideas that animated the Middle Ages—the cult of Antiquity. Interpreted from this perspective, the reign, given the programme of a revival of the Roman Empire carried out at the time, not only made more sense but also acquired marks of greatness. Attempts to vindicate the monarch were also made with regard to classical political history, by scholars who referred to the balance of power in the late 10th century. Bolesław Chrobry's growing stature meant that the Empire faced an alternative: either—as Otto III decided—to offer Poland's ruler very favourable conditions of cooperation or to opt for a

---

6   Past studies concerning Otto III are discussed by Menno Ter Braak, *Kaiser Otto III. Ideal und Praxis im frühen Mittelalter* (Amsterdam: Clausen, 1928), 17–36; Gerd Althoff, *Otto III.*, 1st edition 1996 (Darmstadt, 1997), 1–13.

7   Percy Ernst Schramm, *Kaiser, Rom und Renovatio. Studien und Texte zur Geschichte des römischen Erneuerungsgedankens vom Ende des Karolingischen Reiches bis zum Investiturstreit*, vols. 1–2, Studien der Bibliothek Warburg 17 (Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner, 1929); vol. 1 had several editions, quotations further on in the book are from the 3rd edition, Bad Homburg vor der Höhe: Hermann Gentner Verlag, 1962.

long and ruinous war which, as Henry's example shows, could not bring any satisfying results.[8]

Although thanks to Percy Ernst Schramm's book the issues associated with the figure of Otto III became more attractive, and many more valuable studies were published after his,[9] the reign of this monarch was not put at the centre of German medievalists' attention until slightly more than two decades ago.[10] This is partly thanks to a monograph by Knut Görich,[11] who defied the entire historiographical tradition. He rejected both Schramm's view and traditional interpretations, claiming that the monarch had been no different from other kings from the house of Liudolfing. His monograph provoked a number of reviews and polemical responses, presented in various kinds of publications. There emerged a need for more thorough studies that would be more measured than Görich's in presenting the personality and reign of Otto III, but would also take into account the correct and valuable elements of the German scholar's work.[12]

What contributed to an increase in the interest in Otto III's reign was the anniversary atmosphere. The passage from the second to the third millennium, universally celebrated, encouraged scholars to go back in time to the previous turn of the millennium. On the other hand, in Germany, too, the grand anniversary of such events as the Summit of Gniezno was interpreted in the light of current political developments associated with European integration. The jubilee atmosphere prompted scholars from other countries as well to devote more attention to figures from those days. For obvious reasons, for French and

---

8   Helmut Beumann, "Otto III.," in *Kaisergestalten des Mittelalters*, ed. idem (Munich: C. H. Beck, 1984), 97.

9   Especially Mathilde Uhlirz, *Otto III. 983–1002* (Karl Uhlirz and Mathilde Uhlirz, *Jahrbücher des Deutschen Reiches unter Otto II. und Otto III.*, 1), (Berlin: Duncker and Humblot, 1954).

10   An overview of the latest studies can be found in Jerzy Strzelczyk's "'Diversi diverse sentiebat'. O właściwy obraz Ottona III," *Roczniki Historyczne* 64 (1998): 221–224; idem, "Dwaj wybitni władcy w ujęciu porównawczym," *Przegląd Historyczny* 89 (1998): 453–466; idem, "Naukowe pokłosie," passim.

11   Knut Görich, *Otto III. Romanus, Saxonicus et Italicus. Kaiserliche Rompolitik und sächsische Historiographie*, Historische Forschungen 18 (Sigmaringen: Thorbecke, 1993).

12   *Otto III.—Heinrich II. eine Wende?*, ed. Bernd Schneidmüller and Stefan Weinfurter, Mittelalter Forschungen 1 (Sigmaringen: Thorbecke, 1997); cf. also Althoff, *Otto III*. An important Polish response is provided by J. Strzelczyk's book, *Otton III* (Wrocław, Warsaw and Kraków: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 2000).

Italian historians the main protagonist of the period was Sylvester II—*le pape de l'an Mil*.[13]

The present book is another contribution to the debate about the year 1000. It focuses on one particular issue: the foundation of the Archbishopric of Gniezno. However, its objective is not to reconstruct the course of events; these have been described in the literature in a satisfactory manner, obviously as far as the sources allow. I will be interested instead in the religious context of the establishment of the Polish church province. For this reason I will delve more deeply into the discussion about the year 1000 than might at first seem necessary.

When writing about the religious background, I have to take into account not only the situation in Poland, but also—primarily even—in Western Europe, because those who decided the founding of the Archbishopric of Gniezno were mostly not of Polish origin, and were active in ecclesiastical and aristocratic circles outside Poland. The most important figure among them was Otto III, without whose goodwill the Holy See could not have taken such an important step. That is why the emperor, more so than Bolesław Chrobry, is the protagonist of the present study.

When concluding the present book I realized that not all issues that should have been raised had indeed been examined in it. The most important shortcoming is undoubtedly the omission of the Hungarian analogy. An archbishopric was established in Esztergom more or less at the same time as the Gniezno see, and St. Stephen enjoyed the same favour with Otto III as Bolesław Chrobry.[14] It would thus be proper to write in the same breath about the emergence of the Polish and the Hungarian Church provinces. However I am not prepared for such a task. In order for a comparison between Gniezno and Esztergom to make sense, both cases would have to be examined by means of

---

13   *Gerbert l'Européen. Actes du colloque d'Aurillac 4–7 juin 1996*, Société des lettres, sciences et arts « La Haute Auvergne », Mémoires 3 (Aurillac: Ed. Gerbert, 1996); *Autour de Gerbert d'Aurillac, le pape de l'An Mil*, ed. Emmanuel Guyotjeannin and Emmanuel Poulle, Matériaux pour l'Histoire publiés par l'Ecole des Chartes 1 (Paris: École des chartes, 1996); *Gerbert d'Aurillac—Moine, évêque et pape: d'un millénaire à l'autre. Actes des journées d'étude, Aurillac, 9–10 avril 1999*, Aurillac 2000; *Gerberto d'Aurillac da Abbate di Bobbio al Papa dell'Anno 1000. Atti del Congresso Internazionale Bobbio, Auditorium di S. Chiara, 28–30 settembre 2000*, ed. Flavio G. Nuvolone, Archivum Bobbiense. Studia 4 (Bobbio: Associazione culturale Amici di Archivum Bobiense, 2001).

14   Aleksander Gieysztor, "Sylvestre II et les Eglises de Pologne et Hongrie," in *Gerberto, scienza, storia e mito. Atti del Gerberti Symposium. Bobbio 25–27 luglio 1983*, Archivum Bobiense. Studia 2 (Bobbio: Archivi storici bobiensi, 1985), 733–746.

the same research questionnaire and at the same level of detail. Such a challenge could be taken on only by a scholar who specializes in the history of Poland and is an expert on the history of Hungary at the same time. I do not possess such competences.

The matters discussed in the present book have been touched upon in some of my other publications. These have mostly been scattered remarks. I tried to provide a comprehensive outline of the subject in a paper published in 2000.[15] Later, as I was writing the present book, my insight into many issues grew; I also deemed it necessary to expand the scope of the work to include some additional fields. The results of my studies, corresponding more or less to my present position and concerning some of the detailed issues, were presented in two short articles. Both these articles—in one case with minor cuts and in the other in an expanded version—are included in the present book.[16]

As the text is ready to go to press, I express my profound gratitude to the late Professor Aleksander Gieysztor, an outstanding scholar and eminent expert on the period in which Poland emerged as a state and entered the Christian world. In the 1969/70 academic year I began to attend Professor Gieysztor's seminar devoted to Poland and Europe in the year 1000. It was then that for the first time I had encountered the writings by Rudolf Glaber, Bruno of Querfurt and other authors—sources on which the present book is based. First of all, however, I had an opportunity—at that time and over the many years of working under Professor Gieysztor's guidance—to learn that when studying the history of medieval Poland, we should look at it from a European perspective, and that this was a very effective research method. I have tried to remain faithful to this principle to this day.

I would also like to thank cordially Professor Henryk Samsonowicz, who for thirty years has been a patron of my research and university work, as well as two successive directors of the Institute of History, University of Warsaw: Professors Bronisław Nowak and Michał Tymowski. Notwithstanding the modest possibilities available in Warsaw, they sought to ensure good conditions

---

15   Roman Michałowski, "Początki arcybiskupstwa gnieźnieńskiego," in *1000 lat archidiecezji gnieźnieńskiej*, ed. Jerzy. Strzelczyk and Janusz Górny (Gniezno: Gaudentinum, 2000), 27–48.

16   Roman Michałowski, "Depozycja ciała św. Wojciecha w roku 1000. Przyczynek do dziejów Zjazdu Gnieźnieńskiego," in *Świat pogranicza*, ed. Mirosław Nagielski, Andrzej Rachuba and Sławomir Górzyński (Warsaw: Wydawnictwo DiG, 2003), 45–56 (see below Chapter II.3); idem, "Prądy religijne w imperium ottońskim i ich polityczne implikacje," in *Polska na przełomie I i II tysiąclecia. Materiały Sesji Stowarzyszenia Historyków Sztuki. Poznań, listopad 2000*, ed. Szczęsny Skibiński (Poznań: Stowarzyszenie Historyków Sztuki, 2001), 51–62 (see below Chapter III, point 4).

for my research work. Michał Tymowski was also the first reader of the book. When working on the final version, I used his valuable remarks. I should also mention at this point the pleasant and academically valuable conversations I had with Professor Marian Dygo over several decades, as well as the generous bibliographic assistance which Doctor Krzysztof Skwierczyński was always ready to provide. I was able to borrow some rare books from his private collection. My thanks also go to Richard John Butterwick-Pawlikowski for checking the English and to Dr Shami Ghosh for translating the Latin quotes.

At the end, let me also express my gratitude to the Foundation for Polish Science, which funded the translation of this work.[17]

In Conversione S. *Pauli Apostoli*, AD 2016.

Archbishoprics and Church Provinces in the Early Medieval Latin Church

1 The Emergence of the Archbishopric and the Church Province as Institutions

The territorial organization of the Church emerged in the period of the great ecumenical councils (4th–5th centuries), although the process was slow and had its roots in the Apostolic Age. The fathers who laid the foundations for the organization of the Church tried to reconcile two principles. On the one hand, their assumption was that religious life within each Christian community should be under the watchful eye of the local bishop. However, deeply convinced as they were that the Church was one and indivisible, they put much effort into formulating principles that would guarantee that unity. This led to the emergence of a complex system of institutions bringing together into one whole a network of bishoprics spread over the huge territory of the Roman Empire, institutions that differed in their character and were placed on different levels of the hierarchy.[1]

The highest level was a system comprising the ecumenical council, the Pentarchy and the emperor. Councils were rarely convened—this happened only when important doctrinal issues had to be resolved. Usually they also made pronouncements on ecclesiastical organization and discipline. All bishops had the right to participate in councils. Those enjoying special authority among them were the bishops of Rome, Alexandria and Antioch, joined later by the bishops of Constantinople and Jerusalem. Important dogmatic and disciplinary decisions required the consent of each of these hierarchs; in

---

1 Hans Erich Feine, *Kirchliche Rechtsgeschichte*, vol. 1: *Die katholische Kirche*, 3rd edition (Weimar: Böhlau, 1955), 88–107; Jean Gaudemet, *L'Eglise dans l'Empire Romain*, Histoire du droit et des institutions de l'Eglise en Occident 3 (Paris: Sirey, 1958), 377–466; Vittorio Peri, "La pentarchia: istituzione ecclesiale (IV–VII sec.) e teoria canonico-teologica," in *Bisanzio, Roma e l'Italia nell'alto medioevo*, Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo 34 (Spoleto: Presso la Sede del Centro, 1988), 209–311; Anzelm Weiss, *Biskupstwa bezpośrednio zależne od Stolicy Apostolskiej w średniowiecznej Europie*, Katolicki Uniwersytet Lubelski. Wydział Teologiczny. Rozprawa habilitacyjna (Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw KUL, 1992), 21–99.

addition, each of them exercised jurisdiction over his territory. These vast territories came to be called "patriarchates." There is no doubt that among the dignitaries listed above, some primacy was accorded to the bishop of Rome and that it was more than just honorary primacy.

The most important place in the life of the Church was occupied by the emperor. As early as in the first generation after the Peace of Constantine, Christians formulated a political theology in the light of which the emperor became a representative of God on Earth; he was, in a way, like Christ visibly operating among people.[2] It is, therefore, not surprising that the emperor was considered to have not only the right but also the duty to watch over the Church. The monarch was expected to defend the purity of the faith and to lead his subjects to eternal salvation. None of the patriarchs exercised jurisdiction over the whole territory of the Empire. It is true that the pope did have such powers, but in practice he intervened in matters concerning another patriarchate on exceptional occasions. The emperor was in a different situation. His authority, which he exercised every day in real terms, covered all bishoprics in all the provinces of his vast state.

Between the patriarchate and the bishopric there was another level—ecclesiastical province.[3] To its metropolitan were subordinated bishops from its territory, which often overlapped with that of the province in the secular Roman administration. The rationale behind the establishment of church provinces was a need for cooperation felt by bishops, as well as the conviction that a bishop was responsible not only for his own local community but also for the whole Church. A province was usually headed by a metropolitan—bishop of its most important city. He was regarded as the first among equals, with the decisive role in religious life being played by the synod, the participants of which included all bishops subordinated to the metropolitan. It should be noted that synods were convened often and intervened deeply in matters of the various dioceses.

---

2 Francis Dvornik, *Early Christian and Byzantine Philosophy. Origins and Background*, Dumbarton Oak Studies 9, vols. 1–2 (Washington: Dumbarton Oaks Center for Byzantine Studies, 1966); idem, *Byzance et la primauté romaine*, Unam sanctam 49 (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1964); see also Raffaele Farina, *L'impero e l'imperatore in Euzebio di Cesarea. La prima teologia politica del cristianesimo*, Bibliotheca theologica Salesiana. Fontes 2 (Zürich: Pas, 1966); Waldemar Ceran, "Cesarz w politycznej teologii Euzebiusza z Cezarei i nauczaniu Jana Chryzostoma," *Acta Universitatis Lodzensis. Folia Historica* 44 (1992): 13–27.

3 In addition to the literature listed in footnote 1, see also Anzelm Weiss, "Rola i funkcja prowincji kościelnych w Kościele okresu starożytnego i wczesnego średniowiecza (do VIII w.)," *Roczniki Teologiczno-Kanoniczne* 28 (1981), no. 4: 29–51.

Sometimes there would emerge ecclesiastical structures that separated the patriarchate from the province. An example can be the Church in Roman Africa, which gathered around the bishop of Carthage. His primacy was accepted by all metropolitan sees in the region, whereas the primacy of the pope was recognized only theoretically. True, the local bishops willingly agreed with St. Cyprian, acknowledging that the Catholic Church was built on Peter and that the pope was his successor, but they denied the latter the right to interfere in any matters of the African Church.

The foundation of barbarian kingdoms on the territories of formerly Roman provinces was conducive to the emergence of similar situations. In Visigothic Spain and Merovingian Gaul there emerged "national" Churches of sorts. Religious life went on within the various kingdoms. It was supervised by national synods headed by the monarch, and, to a lesser extent, by provincial synods. Teachings from Rome were a source of inspiration for Merovingian bishops only to a limited degree, while the Spaniards ignored them altogether.

The breakup of the Empire, caused by the barbarian migrations and the Arab invasions, also led to a number of other changes, important from our point of view. Some of them had a crucial significance.[4] First of all, the emperor ceased to rule the western part of the Roman *oecumene*, with his religious authority diminishing with every decade, disappearing entirely in the 8th century. In addition, from the point of view of Christians living in the Germanic kingdoms the existence of the Pentarchy lost any practical significance. Even its memory became somewhat blurred. Contacts with Constantinople were rare and not always friendly, while the patriarchates of Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem were now under the Muslim rule. In such circumstances the bishop of Rome became the only above-par religious authority.

He was able to fill the void left by the emperor, who could not carry out his duties in the West anymore. The duties included the evangelization of pagan countries[5] and in this respect the papacy very successfully replaced the emperor. Gregory the Great sent a mission to the Anglo-Saxons and some of his successors followed the progress of Christianization of that people with considerable concern. Later, the bishop of Rome supported, as far as he could, the evangelizing efforts aimed at converting Frisia, Germania, the Scandinavian

---

4   Friedrich Kempf, "Primatiale und episkopal-synodale Struktur vor der gregorianischen Reform," *Archivum Historiae Pontificiae* 16 (1978): 26–66.

5   For more on the role of the emperor in missions among the pagans, see Peter Schreiner, "Die byzantinische Missionierung als politische Aufgabe: Das Beispiel der Slaven," in *Stephanos. Studia Byzantina ac Slavica Vladímiro Vavřínek ad annum sexagesimum quintum dedicata*, Byzantinoslavica 42 (Prague: Slovanský ústav. Euroslavica, 1995), 525–533.

countries, Bulgaria and the lands of the western Slavs and Magyars, and establishing a church organization there.

The Holy See's evangelizing efforts had one completely unexpected result: they contributed to a change in the form of the Church's territorial organization as well as the way it was understood.[6] Saint Augustine was active in England as the founder of bishoprics and church provinces, authorized in his efforts by Gregory the Great. Papal plenipotentiary powers were used by St. Willibrord in Frisia and Winfrid-Boniface in Franconia, Hesse and Bavaria[7] in establishing bishoprics in those regions. The Holy See also spoke authoritatively regarding ecclesiastical structures in Great Moravia. This stemmed from the nature of things, in a way. Newly Christianized countries did not have dioceses and archdioceses, which had yet to be established. Since the evangelizing missions were authorized by the papacy, the Holy See had to approve the creation of any territorial organization. In these circumstances there gradually emerged a principle whereby the founding of each bishopric, also in countries that had long been Christianized, had to be approved by Rome. In the 10th century this became a legal norm, which was not, however, accepted fully everywhere or by everyone.

Before that there had emerged a principle whereby the founding of any new ecclesiastical province had first to be approved by the Holy See. The first known example is the founding of the Archbishopric of Salzburg in 798.[8] The swift acceptance of the above mentioned norm was facilitated by the disorganization of church institutions in the Frankish state during the late Merovingian period. It led to a degeneration of metropolitan ties that bound the various bishoprics within a province.

Charlemagne decided to revive church provinces while he carried out his huge reform, intended primarily to be a reform of the Church.[9] This stemmed

---

6   For more on the topic, see first of all Emile Lesne, *La Hiérarchie épiscopale. Provinces, métropolitains, primats en Gaule et Germanie depuis la réforme de saint Boniface jusqu'à la mort d'Hincmar. 742–882*, Mémoires et Travaux publiés par des professeurs des Facultés Catholiques de Lille 1 (Lille and Paris: Facultés catholiques, 1905); Kempf, "Primatiale und episkopal-synodale Struktur," 45–57; Rudolf Schieffer, "Papsttum und Bistumsgründungen im Frankenreich," in *Studia in honorem Eminentissimi Cardinalis Alphonsi M. Stickler*, ed. Rosalio José Card. Castillo Lara, Studia et textus historiae iuris canonici 7 (Rome: LAS, 1992), 517–528.

7   However, it must be noted that there are now discussions over whether regular bishoprics were established only by St. Boniface or whether they had existed earlier; see below point 3.

8   Ibid.

9   Heinrich Büttner, "Mission und Kirchenorganisation bis zum Tode Karls des Großen," in *Karl der Große*, vol. 1: *Persönlichkeit und Geschichte*, ed. Helmut Beumann (Düsseldorf: L. Schwann, 1965), 482–487.

mainly from the respect the monarch had for canon law. Since it provided for the existence of provinces, the ruler decided to revive them. That is why he asked the pope to grant *pallia* to newly appointed metropolitans. In this way the highest secular authority confirmed that there was a link between being a metropolitan and having the *pallium* and that, consequently, the Holy See had a formally guaranteed influence over who would hold the office—because the only person granting the insignia in question was the bishop of Rome.

The *pallium*[10]—a woollen band worn about the neck, breast and back—was in late Antiquity an emblem worn by bishops and granted by the emperor, but only in the eastern part of the Empire. In the western part this privilege was reserved only for the bishop of Rome. There is evidence, dating back to the 6th century, of a custom—probably developed earlier—of the *pallium* being conferred by the pope on selected church dignitaries. Initially, this happened sporadically and the privilege was granted only to dignitaries enjoying great authority. It was a gift of contact with the relics of St. Peter, because prior to the conferment the *pallium* was kept at the Confession of the Prince of the Apostles.

The first bishop known to have received the insignia from the pope was Caesarius of Arles. In this case the *pallium* was primarily an honorary distinction, yet it was soon followed by specific powers with regard to all bishops of Gaul as well as Spain (papal vicariate).[11] The insignia undoubtedly had a legal significance when Gregory the Great bestowed it upon Augustine, ordering him to organize the Church in England, a task that included ordaining and appointing bishops. There was a similar situation in the case of St. Boniface, who, having received the *pallium*, felt authorized to organize the Church in Germania. For Arbeo, Bishop of Freising, who wrote and worked in the second

---

10   For more on the pallium, see Kurt-Bogislav Graf von Hacke, *Die Palliumsverleihungen bis 1143. Eine diplomatisch-historische Untersuchung* (Diss. Göttingen, 1898); Joseph Braun, *Die liturgische Gewandung in Occident und Orient nach Ursprung und Entwicklung* (Freiburg i. Br.: Herder, 1907), 620–676; Louis Duchesne, *Origines du culte chrétien*, 5th edition (Paris: E. de Boccard, 1920), 404–410; Jose M. Martí Bonet, *Roma e las iglesias particulares en la conceción del palio a los obispos y arzobispos de occidento. Ano 513–1143* (Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1976); Kempf, "Primatiale und episkopal-synodale Struktur," 46–50; Odilo Engels, "Der Pontifikatsantritt und seine Zeichen," in *Segni e riti nella Chiesa altomedievale occidentale*, vol. 2, Settimane di studio del Centro Italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo 33/11 (Spoleto: Presso la Sede del Centro, 1987), 732–744; [v.] Saxer, in ibid., 768.

11   Horst Fuhrmann, "Studien zur Geschichte mittelalterlichen Patriarchate," *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte. Kanonistische Abteilung* 39 (1953): 167–169; Kempf, "Primatiale und episkopal-synodale Struktur," 46.

half of the 8th century, it was obvious that together with the pallium a bishop received certain prerogatives from the Holy See, reserved only for it, and that the source of these prerogatives was St. Peter.[12]

From the 7th century onwards, English metropolitans, guided by a sense of close communion with the papacy, after ascending to their office would ask Rome to grant them the *pallium*. It might not yet have been a legal requirement, but a custom, which years later became obligatory throughout Latin Europe. The final seal was, as we know, given by Charlemagne. In the 9th century it was already obvious to all that a bishop heading a province had to ask the pope for the *pallium* and that the pope had the right to refuse it. The Holy See even maintained—at least from the second half of the 9th century—that before receiving the insignia in question a metropolitan had no right to ordain suffragan bishops or to undertake any sacramental duties apart from celebrating the mass. On the other hand, sometimes the pallium was granted to church dignitaries who were not metropolitans.

In the 9th century it became customary for a dignitary heading a church province to use the title of archbishop.[13] The title emerged in the eastern part

---

12   Writing about St. Corbinian receiving the pallium from Gregory II, Arbeo says: "Recepto palleo cum sanctiones beati principis apostolorum Petri: ubique praedicationis officium exercere per universum orbem potuisset, ex tanti patris relatione potestatem habuisset, cum suo diligentissime denotato Galliis brivilegio reversus est. Coepitque divinum ex ore illius emanare verbum et mellifluam in audientium effundere predicationem auribus instar vivi fontis, ex cuius vi emanatione amnis efficitur. Coepit namque doctrina illius per universam Galliam paulatim per virorum ac feminarum crescere moribus, tam sacrarum virginum et viduarum quam monachorum et sacerdotum dilatare pectoribus"—*Vita Corbiniani auctore Arbeone*, ed. Bruno Krusch, MGH Scriptores rerum Merovingicarum, vol. 6 (Hanover and Leipzig: Hahn, 1913), cap. 9, 567 ("After he had received the pallium, with the blessing of Saint Peter, leader of the apostles, although he could have exercised the office of preaching anywhere in the world, since he had the power to do so granted by such a father, he returned to Gaul with the privilege most lovingly made out to him. He began to spout the divine word from his mouth and to pour out mellifluous sermons to the ears of his listeners like a living spring, from which, by the force of its surging out, a river is made. And his teachings gradually began to be visible in the customs of men and women in all of Gaul, and began to spread out in the breasts of both the blessed virgins and widows and of the monks and priests"). If not stated otherwise, all translations of Latin quotations in the footnotes are by Shami Ghosh.

13   For more on the origins and spread of the term, see Lesne, *La Hiérarchie épiscopale*, 28, fn. 2; Alessandro Testi-Rasponi, "Archiepiscopus," *Archivum Latinitatis Medii Aevi* 3 (1927): 5–11; Jean-Charles Picard, *Le souvenir des évêques. Sépultures, listes épiscopales et culte des évêques en Italie du Nord des origines au Xᵉ siècle*, Bibliothèque des Ecoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome 268 (Rome: Ecole française de Rome, 1988), 690–692;

of the Roman Empire and originally denoted simply a patriarch, later a bishop exercising authority over several provinces. In the latter case the archbishop thus occupied, as it were, a level between that of patriarch and metropolitan, with the power he exercised being delegated to him—his prerogatives were granted by the patriarch. In Western Europe the title was used for the first time by Maximus, Bishop of Ravenna (6th century). This was connected with the fact that he took over the rights of north Italian metropolitans who had rejected Constantinople's position in the Three-Chapter Controversy. The expansion of Ravenna's powers resulted from a decision by the emperor. The right to the title given to bishops of this Adriatic metropolitan see was confirmed by the Holy See, which also granted it to the Bishop of Milan in the early 8th century.

In the spreading of this term a significant role was played by the developments in England and then by the work of Anglo-Saxon missionaries on the Continent. A very important role in the life of the Church in the British Isles was played in the 7th century by Theodore of Tarsus, who was placed in the see of Canterbury by Rome. He accepted the title of archbishop for two reasons. First, as a speaker of Greek he was very familiar with the term; second, his powers covered not only the province of Canterbury but also the province of York. Thus, he was an archbishop in the traditional meaning of the word. The figure of Theodore was so strongly etched in the memory of the people of England that for them the proper term to describe a bishop heading a province was archbishop and not metropolitan.

Perhaps this was in some way associated with the fact that great Anglo-Saxon missionaries bore this particular title. The Holy See granted it first to Willibrord and then to Boniface, together with the *pallium* and the right to ordain and appoint bishops. As a result, the term became well-known on the Continent. In the second half of the 8th century, before it became synonymous with the term metropolitan, it was granted *ad personam* to the archchaplain as the head of the Frankish Church.[14]

The metropolitan organization revived by Charlemagne was in some respects different from its predecessor. While in late Antiquity and the early Middle Ages metropolitans derived their authority from decisions of provincial

---

Odilo Engels, "Metropolit oder Erzbischof? Zur Rivalität der Erzstühle von Köln, Mainz und Trier bis zur Mitte des 11. Jahrhunderts," in *Dombau und Theologie im mittelalterlichen Köln. Festschrift zur 750-Jahrfeier der Grundsteinlegung des Kölner Domes und zum 65. Geburtstag von Joachim Kardinal Meisner 1998*, ed. Ludger Honnefelder, Norbert Trippen and Arnold Wolff, Studien zum Kölner Dom 6, (Cologne: Kölner Dom, 1998), 286–294.

14   Thomas Martin, "Bemerkungen zur 'Epistola de litteris colendis'," *Archiv für Diplomatik* 31 (1985): 267.

synods, which they headed, and were regarded as first among equal bishops taking part in the synod, now elements of power were brought to the fore. With regard to suffragan bishops, metropolitans used delegated power, the source of which lay in the Holy See. There are reasons to believe that in the 10th century the essence of the office of metropolitan was that of a papal vicariate.[15] Such views were expressed already in the Carolingian period (Rabanus Maurus).[16] It must also be noted that in the 9th–11th centuries provincial synods were convened rarely and in distant locations, and did not play as important a role as they had in the ancient Christian period. This happened partly because the life of the Church, both during the Carolingian and the Ottonian periods, was focused on "state" synods, during which the main figure was not the metropolitan but, perforce, the king.

However, we need to bear in mind that in the new system the archbishop's prerogatives were rather modest and in no way limited the independence of suffragan bishops in matters concerning their dioceses. Only excessive disregard of episcopal duties on the part of diocesan bishops, for example wilful and prolonged absence from the bishopric, gave the metropolitan the right to intervene. However, the metropolitan did have two important instruments of power at his disposal. He was the only person authorised to ordain bishops within the province and the only person with the right to convene provincial synods, which all suffragan bishops were obliged to attend.

2   The Ideological Content of the Term Archbishopric

The existence within the Catholic Church of bishoprics with different positions in the hierarchy provoked the same questions again and again: Why is this and not some other place a metropolitan see? Why is, say, Alexandria higher in the pentarchy than Jerusalem? And why is it Rome and not Antioch or Constantinople that enjoys the primacy?

These or similar questions troubled Christians even before the Council of Nicea and lost none of their relevance in the post-Constantine period or in the Middle Ages. People living in the early 21st century may be surprised and even offended by the high temperatures of the debates about those topics at the time, and may even be inclined to suspect that the debates were mainly about power struggles and human vanity. However, such a view would not reflect the essence of the matter. Of course, the frailties of human nature did play their

---

15   Kempf, "Primatiale und episkopal-synodale Struktur," 55–57.
16   Weiss, *Biskupstwa bezpośrednio zależne*, 74.

part as did church politics—to no small degree—but the stakes were much greater: eternal salvation.

What always remained relevant, after all, was the question of whether and to what extent a given local Church was a place for sanctification and finding the truth. That is why in Antiquity so much weight was put on the Apostolicity of bishoprics, that is, those founded by an Apostle.[17] This was a guarantee that the teachings propagated in such dioceses were orthodox and the spirituality taught there was a true piety leading people to God and salvation. After all, a member of the College of the Twelve could not have spread erroneous teachings leading people astray, but only the teachings he had received from Christ. When two hundred, three hundred or more years had passed since the founding—actual or alleged—of such a Church, guarantees had to be sought in order to confirm that in the meantime the orthodox doctrine had not been tainted by error. In order to dispel any doubts, efforts were made to reconstruct a list of bishops linking the founder Apostle to the bishop holding the office

---

17   Francis Dvornik, *The Idea of Apostolicity of Byzantium and the Legend of the Apostle Andrew* (Cambridge, Massachusetts): Harvard University Press, 1958); Enrico Morini, "Richiami alle tradizioni di apostolicità ed organizzazione ecclesiastica nelle sedi patriarcali d'Oriente," *Bulletino dell'Istituto Storico Italiano per il Medio Evo e Archivio Muratoriano* 89 (1980–1981): 1–69; Peri, "La pentarchia," 225–226. For more on the notion of Apostolic Church, its understanding in the early Middle Ages in Western Europe and the legends associated with it, see, first of all, Emile Amman and Auguste Dumas, *L'Eglise au pouvoir des laïcs (888–1057)*, Histoire de l'Eglise depuis les origines jusqu'à nos jours 7 (Paris: Bloud and Gay, 1948), 179–186 (chapter written by Dumas); valuable remarks can be found in Raul Manselli, *La Religion populaire au Moyen Age. Problèmes de méthode et d'histoire*, Conférences Albert-le-Grand 1973 (Montréal: Institut d'études médiévales Albert-le-Grand, 1975), 68–69. Detailed literature, which is rather extensive, is very fragmented; see e.g. Aline Poensgen, *Geschichtskonstruktionen des frühen Mittelalters zur Legitimierung kirchlicher Ansprüche in Metz, Reims und Trier* (Diss. Marburg/Lahn, 1971), 23–31 and passim; Picard, *Le souvenir des évêques*, 689–699 and passim; Michel Sot, "Le Mythe des origines romaines de Reims au xe siècle," in *Rome et les églises nationales, VIIe–XIIIe. Premier colloque du Groupe universitaire de recherches sur la christianisation de l'Europe occidentale. Tenu au Centre d'Etudes Historiques. Monastère de Malmedy, 2–3 juin 1988*, ed. Claude Carozzi and Philippe George (Aix-en-Provence: Publications de l'Université de Provence, 1988), 55–74; Enrico Morini, "Dall'apostolicità di alcune Chiese dell'Italia bizantina dei secoli VIII e IX. In margine agli 'Analecta Hymnica Graeca'," *Rivista di storia della Chiesa in Italia* 36 (1982): 61–79; Klaus Herbers, "Apostolskość w świadomości i wyobrażeniach. Pytania do planu badań", in *Symbol Apostolski w nauczaniu i sztuce Kościoła do Soboru trydenckiego*, ed. Ryszard Knapiński, Towarzystwo Naukowe Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego. Źródła i Monografie 159 (Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1997), 241–257, especially 252–255.

in a given period. Such a list showed how healthy teachings were passed from generation to generation, and made people believe that the teaching of the current incumbent was identical with that of the Apostles. The guarantee was all the stronger, if the list contained holy bishops. A saint, after all, could not have departed from the orthodox doctrine. Hence the common tendency to venerate many bishops heading a given local Church in the past.

In the eyes of a Christian commune, a founder who was a saint and bishops who were saints as well were also invaluable for another reason. No one doubted that, standing before the Lord's throne in heaven, they interceded for the Church they had left on earth and that they prayed constantly for it not to falter in its faith. This encouraged the faithful and made them believe that it would continue to be a source of truth and sanctification.

Of course, the founder did not have to be one of the Apostles; sometimes the beginnings of a local Church were associated with one of his disciples. The prestige of such a bishopric would be slightly lower, as was perhaps the hope for the Apostle's intercession, but it would be difficult to doubt the authenticity of the teachings spread in such a Church. However, there were local Churches—and their number was by no means small—which could not boast even such a less glorious founder. Either they were established after 1st–2nd century or nothing was known about the first bishop, or his links to the Apostles were not very clear.

Thus, local Churches were not equal, for not all of them provided the faithful with spiritual nourishment to an equal degree. This was often used as an argument that was to explain why one local Church was above another Church in the hierarchy. After all, it seemed natural that greater power should be in the hands of a bishop whose see guaranteed more authentic teachings and was richer in the means of sanctification.

This way of thinking emerged clearly already in late Antiquity and my rather general remarks have concerned those first centuries of Christianity. However, the topic should be examined more systematically and with reference to sources. In this, I shall focus on the Carolingian and Ottonian periods, which are of crucial importance to the subject of the present study.

Let us first examine the attitude to the pentarchy in Carolingian Rome. The judgement was by no means unequivocal. In 871 Anastasius Bibliothecarius, a papal theological adviser, compared the five patriarchs to the five senses in the human body.[18] Just as all senses are necessary for the good of man, so are all five patriarchs necessary for the right functioning of the Church. This does

---

18   *Anastasii Bibliothecarii Epistolae sive praefationes*, ed. Ernst Perels and Gerhard Laehr, *Epistolae aevi Karolini*, vol. 5, MGH Epistolae, 7 (Berlin: Weidmann, 1928), 409. See Peri,

not mean that they are equal; the pope comes to the fore, since he is the most insightful and sees the furthest. Remaining faithful to his metaphor, Anastasius compares him to the sense of sight, the most important sense in the human body. However, the author is in no doubt that not only Rome's primacy but also the pentarchy as a whole emerged because such was the will of Christ himself.

A few years earlier, Pope Nicholas I had expressed a different view on the matter in a letter to Boris-Michael, the ruler of the Bulgarians.[19] He removed Constantinople and Jerusalem from the group of the most important sees, believing that they owed their high stature solely to the emperor's will. He claimed that only Rome, Alexandria and Antioch had the right to enjoy true authority. In order to justify this, he used a theory formulated two hundred years earlier by Pope Damasus. Rome's high status stemmed from the fact that this see was established by St. Peter and St. Paul; Antioch's—because St. Peter had initially been a bishop there; while Alexandria could enjoy its authority, because it had been founded by St. Mark the Evangelist, a disciple of the Prince of the Apostles and his spiritual son. In order to make this last view more specific, Nicholas put forward a claim that Mark had been baptized by Peter. As we can see, the pope introduces a hierarchy of bishoprics which, in his opinion, are the most important in Christendom. Their place in this classification is determined by the person of their founder. Since the author of the letter defends Rome's prerogatives, this is a very far-reaching, Peter-centred interpretation. A leading role in the Church could be played only by a see established by the Prince of the Apostles or his spiritual son. Since Constantinople and Jerusalem did not fulfil this criterion, there was no place for them among the Churches enjoying the highest authority. That the primacy of the Eternal City was based on its links to St. Peter had been constantly repeated since Antiquity. But here the same rule of interpretation was applied to other bishoprics as well.

The source quoted above is very thought-provoking. It is an official statement by a great man of the Church, who formulates his views in a letter to one of the most powerful rulers in Europe at the time. This is about a matter of fundamental significance to the Holy See: who—Rome or Constantinople—will Christianize Bulgaria and to which of these sees the Bulgarian Church will be subordinated in the future. This is the context in which the argument referring

---

"La pentarchia," 273. For information about the Byzantine understanding of the pentarchy, see Dvornik, *The Idea of Apostolicity*, 267–271.

19   *Nicolai I. Papae Epistolae ad res orientales, praecipue ad causam Ignatii et Photii pertinentes*, ed. Ernst Perels, *Epistolae aevi Karolini*, vol. 4, MGH Epistolae 6 (Berlin: Weidmann, 1925), no. 99, 596–597. Peri, "La pentarchia," 240–242.

to the founder of the bishopric is used, the argument that is to determine the kind of authority due to that bishopric. We see how seriously such arguments were treated.

The Carolingian era was a period in which Frankish dioceses spared neither effort nor resources to collect data concerning the past of the local Church, to reconstruct the list of its bishops, to ascertain where they had been buried, to exhume their bodies and to bring them to one shrine. Very often all of them were regarded as saints. The cathedral clergy or monks from a monastery important to the diocese paid particular attention to its first bishop. His lives were written and their authors meticulously incorporated the information from Merovingian or earlier sources, considerably reinterpreting and amplifying it. The bishops were usually historical figures. They had indeed come on missions to Gaul in Roman times and in many cases died as martyrs. However, Carolingian hagiographers turned them into monumental figures. First of all, the life of the first bishop of a given diocese would be set—usually contrary to the historical reality—in the first decades of Christianity. The bishop was usually presented as a disciple of St. Peter or—much less often—of St. Paul. The disciple was allegedly sent by one of the Apostles to a specific city with a mission to spread Christianity and found a Church. A classic example of such a monumentalized story is the case of St. Denis, although more important to his apotheosis than his being the first Bishop of Paris was the fact that he was a patron of the Carolingians. Another figure worth mentioning is that of St. Clement, the legendary first Bishop of Metz, although in this case, too, the search for Apostolic roots of this see was dictated by ideological and political considerations, going far beyond the local context. As we know, one of its bishops was the progenitor of the Carolingians, St. Arnulf.[20] However, generally, the cult of the founder-bishop of the local Church did not spread, at least in its early stages, beyond the borders of the diocese. Among the many examples that come to mind, I would like to mention the figure of St. Martial, to whom I shall return later.

Compiling a list of bishops, venerating them, attempting to link the origins of the diocese to the work of the Apostles—all this could be explained to some extent by reasons mentioned above: the sanctity of bishops and, in particular,

---

20 Poensgen, *Geschichtskonstruktionen*, 9–72. These remarks are based mostly on the writings of Paul the Deacon. For remarks about the Ottonian period, see Jean-Charles Picard, "Le recours aux origines. Les Vies de saint Clément, premier évêque de Metz, composées autour de l'an Mil," in *Religion et Culture autour l'an mil. Royaume capétien et Lotharingie*, ed. Dominique Iogna-Prat and Jean-Charles Picard (Paris: Picard, 1990), 291–299.

Apostolic origins of the local Church guaranteed that the Church was a source of truth and sanctification. However, this explanation, although accurate in many cases, does not reflect the full complexity of the situation.

We need to realize how the clergy in the Carolingian period viewed the history of the Church.[21] This view, which continued to be held even in Ottonian times, left what is probably its clearest mark in the so-called Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals. They are a compilation of sources of canon law, both authentic documents and forgeries, and belong, as a whole, to the apocrypha. Made in the second quarter of the 9th century, the compilation provides an excellent insight into the views and aspirations of the intellectual elite of the Frankish clergy.

In a letter allegedly written by Pope Clement I to James the Brother of the Lord, we can read that

> Episcopos autem per singulas civitates, quibus ille [sc. s. Petrus] non miserat, per doctos et prudentes ut serpentes simplicesque sicut columbas iuxta Domini praeceptionem nobis mittere praecepit. Quod etiam facere inchoaverimus et Domino opere ferente facturi sumus, vos autem per vestras dioeceses episcopos sacrate et mittite, quia nos ad alias partes, quod isdem iussit agere curabimus. Aliquos vero ad Gallias Spaniasque mittimus, et quosdam ad Germaniam et Italiam atque ad reliquas gentes dirigere cupimus, ubi in ferociores et rebelliores gentes fore cognoverimus, illuc dirigere sapientiores et austerores necesse habemus.[22]

---

21   For more on this issue, see Vittorio Peri, "La Chiesa di Roma e le missioni 'ad gentes' (sec. VIII–IX)," in *Il primato del vescovo di Roma nel primo millenario. Ricerche e testimonianze. Atti del Symposium Storico-Teologico, Roma, 9–13 Ottobre 1989*, ed. Michele Maccarrone, Pontificio Comitato di Scienze Storiche. Atti e documenti 4 (Vatican City: Libreria Ed. Vaticana, 1991), 567–642.

22   *Epistola Clementis prima ad Iacobum fratrem Domini*, cap. 27, in *Decretales Pseudo-Isidorianae et Capitula Angilramni*, ed. Paul Hinschius (Leipzig: Tauchnitz, 1863), 39 ("Moreover he commanded us to send bishops to all cities where he himself [i.e. St. Peter] had not sent any, who should be learned, cunning as serpents and innocent as doves, as the Lord commanded. And even as we have begun to do this, and with God providing assistance shall do it: you, however, consecrate and send out bishops in your dioceses, since we shall take care of other regions, as he himself commanded we do. Indeed, we are sending some to Gaul and Spain, and wish to send others to Germany and Italy and the other remaining peoples, where we know they will be among rebellious and wild peoples, and we feel that we must send wiser and more severe bishops to those place").

Thus we learn that St. Peter decided to sent a bishop to every city. He did not manage to personally put his plans into practice, so he left the task to his successor. Readers may get the impression that a complete network of dioceses, covering the entire Christian *ecumene*, was planned already at the beginning of the Church history and that soon afterwards those dioceses were indeed established. It was also decided at the time that each *civitas* would get its own bishop—one bishop, as suggests another fragment of the letter, and not two or three.

Now let us turn to a letter by Pseudo-Anacletus:

> Provintiae autem multo ante Christi adventum tempore divisae sunt maxima ex parte, et postea ab Apostolis et beato Clemente praedecessore nostro ipsa divisio est renovata et in capite provintiarum, ubi dudum primates legis erant saeculi ac prima iuditiaria potestas, ad quos qui per reliquas civitates commorabantur, quando eis necesse erat, qui ad aulam imperatorum vel regum confugere non poterant, vel quibus permissum non erat, confugiebant pro oppressionibus vel iniustitiis suis ipsosque apellabant, quotiens opus erat, sicut in lege eorum praeceptum erat, ipsis quoque in civitatibus vel locis nostris patriarchas vel primates, qui unam formam tenent licet diversa sint nomina, leges divinae et ecclesiasticae poni et iussae sunt, ad quos episcopi, si necesse fuerit, confugerent, eos apellarent et ipsi nomine primatum et non alii. Reliquae vero metropolitanae civitates, quae minores iudices habebant, licet maiores comitibus essent, haberent metropolitanos suos, qui praedictis iuste oboedirent primatibus, sicut in legibus saeculi olim ordinatum erat, qui non primatum, set et metroplitanorum aut archiepiscoporum nomine fruerentur.[23]

---

[23]   *Epistola Analecti Secunda ad episcopos Italiae directa*, cap. 26, in *Decretales Pseudo-Isidorianae*, 79 ("For indeed the provinces were divided into parts long before the coming of Christ, and afterwards, the same boundaries were recreated by the Apostles and by Saint Clement, our predecessor. And in the capitals of the provinces, until recently there were the primates of secular law and judicial power, to whom those people from all other cities went when they had need: those who were not able, or not permitted, to find succour at the court of the emperor or king fled to these primates when they were oppressed or suffered injustice, and called to them whenever they were in need, as instructed in their laws. In those very cities and places our patriarchs and primates (who have the same form, even if they have different titles) are bidden, and divine and ecclesiastical laws are to be given. Let the bishops, if it should be necessary, take refuge with them and call out to them, and they alone should have the title of primate, not any others. The other metropolitan cities that had lesser judges (even if they were greater than counts) might have their own metropolitans who were rightly obedient to the afore-mentioned primates, just

We learn from it that the Apostles and St. Clement also established the institution of the patriarchate and that of ecclesiastical province. But this was not just about a level in the Church hierarchy—the Apostles and Clement decided, moreover, which city was to become a patriarchal see and which a metropolitan see.

As we can see, the Frankish clerics were convinced that the Church acquired its final form, as it were, at the very beginning of its existence. It was at that time that fundamental decisions were taken in this respect, also when it came to the rank of the various bishoprics. These decisions were irrevocable, as another epistle by Pseudo-Anacletus suggests.[24] The map of the Church was ultimately decided at the very beginning of its existence, not only in theory. The various patriarchates, ecclesiastical provinces and dioceses indeed began their activity at the time.

This makes it easier to understand clergymen's passionate interest in the history of their own diocese. They were, in a way, forced to reconstruct its history in this way to make it clear that it had been established at the very beginning of the history of the Catholic Church and that it had been established on the order of the Prince of the Apostles. Had they failed to do so, the prestige of their bishopric would have been put to a severe test. After all, someone might have come to a conclusion that a given diocese or archdiocese was not in God's plans, meaning that it was superfluous or at least not very important.

The way the history of Christianity was understood also had its own specificity. It was regarded as obvious that there was a correspondence between the territorial structure of the Church and the administrative division of the Roman Empire. This view, in fact, reflected the actual state of affairs. After all, the three oldest patriarchates were located in the three most important political and economic centres existing in the late 3rd and early 4th centuries in the Empire, while metropolitan sees were usually located in the capitals of provinces of the civilian administration. This was a result of a natural development of Christianity and, from the time of Constantine the Great, also of a conscious policy on the part of the emperor. However, Carolingian intellectuals

---

as it was once ordained in the secular laws; and they might have enjoyed the title of metropolitans or archbishops, but not of primates").

24   "Privilegia enim Ecclesiarum vel sacerdotum sancti Apostoli iussu Salvatoris intermerata et inviolata eis decreverunt manere temporibus"—*Epistola Analecti papae prima*[…] *omnibus episcopis scripta*, cap. 15, in *Decretales Pseudo-Isidorianae*, 73 ("They commanded that the privileges of the churches and priests of the blessed apostle should, by command of the Saviour, remain undefiled and inviolate at all times").

interpreted this in accordance with their own beliefs. A characteristic example of this way of thinking is Pseudo-Anaclete's letter quoted above.

According to the author of this apocryphal document, the division into provinces was made twice: long before the birth of Christ and later, when the division was confirmed by the Apostles. On the other hand, Pseudo-Clement says that, in accordance with St. Peter's will, the seats of archbishops were located in cities in which the pagans had *archiflamines minores*, that is lower-level priests. Wherever there were *primi flamines*, that is higher-rank priests, such cities became seats of primates, that is, patriarchs. [25]

We could say that the Christian author found a peculiar role model for himself. This only seems paradoxical. Early medieval intellectuals thought in a Platonic fashion.[26] They believed that the administrative division of the world was made first in God's mind and that the visible divisions made by humans were only implementations of plans made in heaven. Emperors—including pagan ones—set the boundaries of provinces and established their capitals, which already existed in the ideal sense. The Apostles did the same and the boundaries and sees had to be the same as before, because they reflected the same eternal reality that existed in the Lord's mind.

If the administrative divisions were determined by God, they could not change. That is why, when the Apostles confirmed, by their authority, the existing boundaries and the status of sees of various levels, it became clear that these divisions had to remain unchanged till the end of world. In practice this

---

25 "In illis vero civitatibus, in quibus olim apud ethnicos primi flamines eorum atque primi legis doctores erant, episcoporum primates poni vel patriarchas qui reliquorum episcoporum iudicia et maiora quotiens necesse foret negotia in fide agitarent, et secundum domini voluntatem, sicut sancti constituerunt apostoli, ita ut ne quis iniuste periclitaretur definirent. In illis vero civitatibus, in quibus dudum apud praedictos erant ethnicos eorum archiflamines, quos tamen minores tenebant quam memoratos primates, archiepiscopos institui praecepit, qui non tamen primatum, sed archiepiscoporum fruerentur nomine"—*Epistola Clementis I*, cap. 28–29, 39 ("Indeed, in those cities in which once among the pagans the principal priests and doctors of law resided, the primates or patriarchs of the bishops should be established, who could deliberate on the judgements or other major affairs of the remaining bishops whenever that should be necessary, and according to the will of God (as the holy apostles had ordained), in such a manner that they could explain them lest anyone should attempt to endanger them unjustly. Indeed, in those cities in which till recently among the afore-mentioned peoples the arch-priests resided, which had both the lesser priests as well as the primates just spoken of, he commanded that archbishops should be established, who should use the title not of primates, but of archbishops").

26 Peri, "La Chiesa di Roma," 568–588.

meant that when the seat of an archbishopric was in a specific city, it was to remain there, and if a city used to be an imperial capital, then the local Church should, for ever and ever, play an important role in the Catholic Church.

In the second half of the 9th century and in the 10th century, the influence of Pseudo-Isidore's Decretals was greater that scholars once thought.[27] Something else matters more, however. These documents reflected a way of thinking characteristic of the period. This is why they enable us to understand the actions of those church dignitaries who never saw the canonical collection in question.

However, the collection was very well known in the 850s and 860s in Trier, which can be seen in the policy pursued by the local bishop, Theudgaud, who decided to take a risky step. He tried to obtain for his see the status of a primatial see and to achieve that he used Pseudo-Isidore's Decretals, which provided for the existence of such a level in church administration, a level placed between the Holy See and the metropolitan see. The canonist forger referred in his concept to late Roman administrative divisions. Their characteristic feature was that there were provinces the names of which were the same except for their ordinal numbers. Thus, e.g. in addition to Belgica I, with its capital in Trier, there was also Belgica II, with its capital in Rheims. Pseudo-Isidore formulated a principle whereby the metropolitan of a province with an ordinal number of I in its name held primacy over the metropolitans of the other provinces with the same name. Thus, following this line of reasoning, it could be said that the Archbishop of Trier had the authority of primate over the Archbishop of Rheims.

This was the conclusion arrived at by Theudgaud, who thus laid himself open to a determined counteraction by Hincmar of Rheims, a bishop who had done much to raise the authority of his own see.[28] The plan failed and Theudgaud himself, involved in a dispute over the legality of King Lothar's marriage, was deposed in 863.[29] Perhaps, however, his efforts were not completely in vain after all. In any case, in the 946–948 dispute over who was the rightful arch-

---

27   These influences are reconstructed by Horst Fuhrmann in his monumental work *Einfluss und Verbreitung der pseudoisidorischen Fälschungen*, vols. 1–3, MGH 24/I–III (Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1972–1974).

28   For more on Hincmar's personality, views and policies, see Jean Devisse's monumental monograph, *Hincmar archevêque de Reims 845–882*, vols. 1–3, Travaux d'histoire éthico-politique, 29 (Geneva: Droz, 1975–1976), in this context especially vol. 2, 643–657.

29   Egon Boshof, "Köln-Mainz-Trier. Die Auseinandersetzung um die Spitzenstellung im deutschen Episkopat in ottonisch-salischer Zeit," *Jahrbuch des Kölnischen Geschichtsvereins* 49 (1978): 20–22.

bishop of Rheims, a crucial role was played by Ruotbert, Archbishop of Trier. He must have exercised rights going beyond the prerogatives of an archbishop, as Rheims was clearly outside the borders of his own province.

The 10th and 11th centuries were a period marked by constant rivalry among German metropolitans over primacy.[30] The dispute involved mainly three archbishops: of Trier, Mainz and Cologne, with the objective of their rivalry being religious as well as unequivocally political. At stake was the leadership of the Imperial Ottonian-Salian Church, especially the office of archchaplain and the right to crown kings as well as to convene and preside over synods. As they were vying for primacy, the bishops tried to strengthen their position by obtaining privileges from the Holy See. This was about the right of primacy in the German Church, the right to exercise the office of papal vicariate, and about various kinds of honorary prerogatives. Some tried to help themselves by falsifying papal bulls.

However, it is very difficult to reconstruct the events associated with the dispute, as there are serious doubts as to whether the papal bulls granting these or other privileges are authentic. We know, of course, some notorious forgeries, but there are also documents whose authenticity has been debated for many years and we cannot always hope to resolve the controversy any time soon.[31] Consequently, there is no clarity as to facts of vital importance; for example, we do not know whether a given bishop was indeed granted the rank of primate or whether he only usurped it.

The Archbishopric of Trier joined the fight armed with various ideological instruments, compiled in fact as early as the second half of the 10th century, during the pontificate of its great archbishops: Theodoric (965–977) and Egbert (977–993).[32] First of all, a theory was formulated at the time—based on ideas developed in the Carolingian period—whereby Trier was an Apostolic Church.

---

30 Helmut Beumann, "Die Bedeutung Lotharingiens für die ottonische Missionspolitik im Osten," 1st edition 1969, in idem, *Wissenschaft vom Mittelalter* (Cologne and Vienna: Böhlau, 1972), 377–409; Boshof, "Köln-Mainz-Trier," 19–48; Engels, "Metropolit oder Erzbischof," 264–294.

31 The debate was revived after the publication of Mogens Rathsack, *Die Fuldaer Fälschungen*, translation from the Danish edition, 1980, vols. 1–2, Päpste und Papsttum 24 (Stuttgart: A. Hiersemann, 1989); see Engels, "Metropolit oder Erzbischof," 288 and passim.

32 Eugen Ewig, "Kaiserliche und apostolische Tradition im mittelalterlichen Trier," 1st edition 1956/1958, in idem, *Spätantikes und fränkisches Gallien. Gesammelte Schriften*, Munich: Artemis, 1979), 51–90; Poensgen, *Geschichtskonstruktionen*, 94–143 and passim; Boshof, "Köln-Mainz-Trier," 24–35; Rüdiger Fuchs, "La Tradition apostolique et impériale à Trèves: mythes de fondations et leurs monuments", in *Epigraphie et iconographie. Actes du Colloque tenu à Poitiers les 5–8 octobre 1995*, ed. Robert Favreau, Civilisation Médiévale 2

It was probably during Theodoric's and subsequently Egbert's time that a Life of Saints Eucharius, Valerius and Maternus was written, providing the readers with the following information.[33] St. Peter, inspired by the Holy Spirit, sent his disciples Eucharius, Valerius and Maternus to carry the Good News to Gaul and Germania, ordaining the first of the three as bishop, the second—deacon and the third—subdeacon. The missionaries managed to convert Trier, previously a leading centre of pagan cult, as well as a majority of people living in Gaul and Germania. Eucharius became the Bishop of Trier, while Valerius and Maternus were his successors. The document also describes an interesting event. St. Maternus died on his way to Trier, so when Eucharius returned to Rome with the news, St. Peter gave him his staff, thanks to which Eucharius was able to act on behalf of the Apostle. The touch of the staff restored the dead man to life. The hagiographer does not say what became of the staff later, but the readers may surmise that it remained in Eucharius' possession.

The motif of the Prince of the Apostles' staff played an important role in the ideological concept of the ecclesiastical see in question. It was most likely during Egbert's pontificate that a bull of Pope Sylvester I (314–335) was fabricated,[34] containing some very bold statements. The pope renews Trier's primacy over all bishops in Gaul and Germania—the primacy once granted by St. Peter to his disciples Eucharius, Valerius and Maternus, by giving them his own pastoral staff. The forger drew far-fetched conclusions from this fact. He claimed

---

(Poitiers: Centre d'études supérieures de civilisation médiévale, 1996, 57–74, especially till 68; Engels, "Metropolit oder Erzbischof," especially 268–276.

33   *Vita ss. Eucharii, Valerii, Materni, auctore Golschero monacho Trevirensi, ex variis veteribus mss. Codicibus* [BHL 2655], *Acta Sanctorum*, Ianuarii vol. 3 (Paris: Taurini, 1863), 533–537.

34   JK †179; Heinrich Volbert Sauerland, *Trierer Geschichtsquellen des* XI. *Jahrhunderts* (Trier: Paulinus-Druckerei, 1889), 89: "Sicut in gentilitate propria virtute, sortire et nunc Trevir super Gallos et Germanos primatum, quem tibi prae omnibus harum gentium episcopis in primitivis christianae religionis doctoribus, Euchario, Valerio, Materno, per baculum caput ecclesiae Petrus significavit habendum, suam quodammodo minuens dignitatem, ut te participem faceret, quem ego Silvester eius servus successione indignus per patriarcham Agricium renovans confirmo". See *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum. Germania Pontificia*, vol. 10: *Provincia Treverensis*, part 1: *Archidioecesis Treverensis*, ed. Egon Boshof (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1992), no. †1, 22–23 ("Just as the head of the church Peter, by his own virtue, indicated by means of the staff that primacy (which is to be had by you over all other bishops of Gaul and Germany) was given to the ancient teachers of Christian religion in heathendom, Eucharius, Valerius, and Maternus, diminishing his own dignity to some extent, he indicated also, so that he might make you partake of this primacy, that Trier was allotted primacy over Gaul and Germany. I, Silvester, his servant unworthy of succeeding him, renew and confirm this primacy through patriarch Agricius").

that by offering his staff, the Prince of the Apostles diminished is some way his own dignity. The author may have meant that Peter renounced direct authority over the countries beyond the Alps.

The Trier Church did indeed possess this very valuable relic. In the mid-10th century it belonged to the Bishopric of Metz. From there it was brought to Cologne by Archbishop Bruno, whose successor, Warin, presented a fragment of the staff to Archbishop Egbert in 980. The latter ordered a magnificent reliquary with a rich iconographic programme to be made for the staff, a reliquary that has survived to this day.[35] It contained depictions of St. Peter as well as Eucharius, Valerius, Maternus and selected Bishops of Rome and Trier. This was a way to express the belief that the Church on the Moselle River was a truly Apostolic Church. There was a link going back to St. Peter in the form of an unbroken line of Bishops of Trier, most of whom had been saints. Another striking element is a parallelism of representations: representatives of the Roman Church on the one hand, and the Church on the Moselle River on the other. We could say that Egbert, whose image adorns the reliquary as one of many, is a successor of the Prince of the Apostles by the same token as Pope Benedict VII, also depicted on the reliquary. Both have authority taken over from St. Peter, with its source being for Egbert the staff kept in the reliquary.

The church circles in Trier used arguments taken from secular history as well. People still vividly remembered that in Antiquity the city was a capital of the Roman Empire and that the cathedral was, in fact, a transformed imperial palace. In addition, they constantly remembered Empress Helena and the role she had played in Trier. However, the Roman past, however glorious, did not satisfy the ambitions of the local clergy. As early as in the second half of the 10th century there began to spread a view that the see in question was older than the Eternal City itself, for it had been founded by the eponymous Trebeta, son of Ninus. Ninus, a contemporary of the biblical Abraham, was the founder of Nineveh and husband of Queen Semiramis.[36] The founding of Nineveh took place at the very beginning of human history, even before the birth of Romulus and Remus.

The intellectuals who spread this theory wanted to achieve something more than just vain glory. Their thinking followed the lines familiar from Pseudo-Isidore: they realized that secular history was a prefiguration of sacred history, as it were, and, consequently, the status of a city in the secular order indicated

---

35   See Table 11 (outside the text) in Fuchs, "La Tradition apostolique."

36   Ilse Haari-Oberg, *Die Wirkungsgeschichte der Trierer Gründungsgeschichte vom 10. bis 15. Jahrhundert*, Europäische Hochschulschriften, Reihe III: Geschichte und ihre Hilfswissenschaften 607 (Bern: Lang, 1994).

the place it should occupy in the church hierarchy. Indeed, Sylverster I's bull mentioned above contains the following argument: the primacy of the Bishopric of Trier is due to the fact that in pagan times Trier enjoyed a very high status.[37]

Of particular significance is the argumentation presented in Pope John XIII's bull of 22 January 969 for Archbishop Theodoric[38] If it is authentic, which many scholars still suggest and which is probably true, the document reflects the official position of the Roman Curia (the dictation must have come from the addressee, but the papal chancellery did not, after all, authenticate everything submitted to it). If, on the other hand, we are dealing with a forgery, the source provides us with information about the views of Trier's intellectual circles, but given the significance of the matter, these arguments had to be carefully considered.[39] After all, this was about privileges which the Holy See had allegedly granted not in some distant, half-mythical past, but contemporaneously.

The prerogatives conferred by John XIII could be summarized as follows: during synods held in Gaul and Germania, the Archbishop of Trier was to sit right behind the papal legate, and when the legate was absent—he was to preside over the synod personally. In addition, he was to serve as papal vicar. The document explains why the archbishop was entitled to such privileges. Trier was the oldest Church in Gaul and, moreover, had been founded by disciples of St. Peter, who had sent them there.[40]

The privileges are generous: primacy and papal vicariate in all Gaul and Germania granted not only to Theodoric personally, but also to all his successors. We can thus see how great a role was played in the hierarchization of local Churches by the belief in the Apostolicity of some of them as well as the fact that some of them had been born earlier than others.

---

37   JK †179.

38   *Papsturkunden*, vol. 1, no. †195, 384–387.

39   Following Rathsack's arguments, *Die Fuldaer Fälschungen*, 308, the last editor concluded that the bull was a forgery, see *Papsturkunden*, vol. 1, 384–385. Its authenticity is defended by, for example, Engels, "Metropolit oder Erzbischof," especially 268–270; Helmut Beumann, *Theutonum nova metropolis. Studien zur Geschichte des Erzbistums Magdeburg in ottonischer Zeit*, ed. Jutta Krimm-Beumann, Quellen und Forschungen zur Geschichte Sachsen-Anhalts 1 (Cologne: Böhlau, 2000), 71–81.

40   See e.g. the following sentence: "Neque enim dignum est, ut illius ecclesie [sc. Treverensis] presul cęteris non habeatur prelatus, huius honor in illis partibus sub ipso apostolorum principe extitit primitivus"—*Papsturkunden*, vol. 1, no. †195, 386 ("For truly it is not fitting that the prelate of this church [i.e. of Trier] should not be superior to others, as he has had an ancient honour in these parts under the very leader of the apostles").

Irrespective of whether the first bishops of Trier were indeed disciples of St. Peter or not, one thing is unquestionable: the local Church was certainly established in ancient times. We may reject the view according to which the city in question was founded by Queen Semiramis' stepson, but there is no denying that it was once one of the capitals of the Roman Empire. This is obvious to us and was obvious to people living in the 9th–11th centuries. The magnificent monuments of ancient art and technical construction skills which can be found in Trier and which still look remarkable today must have made a huge impression in the early Middle Ages. They testified indisputably to the fact that the city had been a great secular and ecclesiastical metropolis in Antiquity.

However, there is another issue to be taken into account: in the 8th century the Church began to include in its organization areas situated outside the Roman *limes*, in countries which had never been Christian in the past. The following centuries were a period in which the seats of dioceses or even archdioceses were founded in those territories. In no way were these facts compatible with the theories advocated by Pseudo-Isidore. New bishoprics and archbishoprics were not founded by disciples of the Apostles, nor were they situated in Roman provinces, not to mention capitals of Roman provinces. Was this problem noticed and, if so, were there any attempts to solve it?

Let us try to examine this question using the example of Magdeburg.[41] Otto I decided to establish an archbishopric in Magdeburg in 955, but despite a favourable response from the Holy See the project dragged on for years, because the monarch's decision came up against exceptionally strong resistance.[42] There were loud protests from two hierarchs: first from William, Archbishop of Mainz, and then Bernard, Bishop of Halberstadt. Their position was that if the emperor's plans were to be implemented, this could be to the detriment of their wealth and prestige. Magdeburg was within the jurisdiction

---

41   The literature dealing with the foundation of the Archbishopric of Magdeburg and the earliest period of its existence is vast. The most systematic and, at the same time, most comprehensive contribution can be found in Dietrich Claude, *Geschichte des Erzbistums Magdeburg bis in das 12. Jahrhundert*, vol. 1: *Die Geschichte der Erzbischöfe bis auf Ruotger (1124)*, Mitteldeutsche Forschungen 67/1 (Cologne and Vienna: Böhlau, 1972).

42   See Helmut Beumann, "Entschädigung von Halberstadt und Mainz bei der Gründung des Erzbistums Magdeburg," in *Ex ipsis rerum documentis*. *Festschrift Harald Zimmermann*, ed. Klaus Herbers, Hans-Henning Kortüm, and Carlo Servatius (Sigmaringen: Thorbecke, 1991), 383–398; Gerd Althoff, "Widukind von Corvey. Kronzeuge und Herausforderung," *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 27 (1993): 262–267; Ernst-Dieter Hehl, "Kaisertum, Rom und Papstbezug im Zeitalter Otto I.," in *Ottonische Neuanfänge. Symposion zur Ausstellung "Otto der Grosse, Magdeburg und Europa"*, ed. Bernd Schneidmüller and Stefan Weinfurter (Mainz: P. von Zabern, 2001), 229–235.

of the metropolitan see of Mainz, meaning that were it to be raised to the rank of archbishopric, this would mean that the province in question would lose a part of its territory which would go to the new diocese. Moreover, there was a risk that the new province would include bishoprics located in Polabia—Brandenburg and Havelberg—hitherto subordinated to Mainz. Archbishop William was concerned about Otto I's plans not only because his province would become smaller, but also because the plans would question the role it wanted to play. It would be cut off from missionary territories and missions among the pagans were an important part of the ideology of both the Ottonian monarchy and the German Church. I shall examine this topic in greater detail in Chapter II.

Magdeburg was part of the Halberstadt diocese, but Bernard's attitude to the monarch's plans was initially favourable, because originally the diocese was not supposed to be divided. The plan was only to transfer its seat from Halberstadt to the city on the Elbe River, with Bernard, Bishop of Halberstadt, becoming Archbishop of Magdeburg. This meant that Bernard would be promoted, a move against which he had no intention to protest. The situation changed, when Otto I modified his original idea. Magdeburg was to be separated from Halberstadt and turned into a separate diocese. Thus the monarch wanted to mollify William, who would no longer be at risk of losing such an important bishopric. However, it is not surprising that in these circumstances Bernard became a fierce opponent of the royal plans.

William and Bernard were important figures on the political chessboard, regardless of the ecclesiastical offices they held. The former was Otto's natural son. We cannot reconstruct Bernard's genealogy, but we do know that he came from the highest ranks of Saxon aristocracy. Judging from his name, he may have belonged to the House of Billung. Thus the two bishops' protests were successful not only because there were strong grounds for them in canon law. This aspect of the problem used to be the main focus of authors writing about the subject. However, what mattered too was the social and political standing of the individuals who voiced the protest. There was also another factor, very rarely taken into consideration.

There were many more people displeased with the royal plans, people including a considerable part of Saxon ecclesiastic and political elites. We are dealing here with resistance manifested by complete silence. There was not even the slightest mention of the planned and then already existing Archbishopric of Magdeburg in the most valuable documents of Ottonian historiography from the third quarter of the 10th century. Nothing was written about it by Widukind and Hrotsvitha, or by Routger in his *Life of Bruno*, or by the author who continued Regino's work. These were all authors who were

keenly interested in the current affairs and tried to take a stance on the main political and ideological issues of the period. It also seems that the opponents of the imperial project included Matilda, the Queen Mother, who appears to have been closely linked to Bernard. In a broader perspective—the plans caused anxiety among the monks of Corvey as well as nuns from great imperial abbeys, such as Quedlinburg, Gandersheim and Nordhausen.

This is by no means surprising. The founding of the Magdeburg province threatened the existing relations in Saxony. After all, the archbishopric and the new suffragan bishoprics—we know that they were in the end Merseburg, Meissen and Zeitz—had to be endowed and the fear was that this would be at the expense of the imperial monasteries. However, this was not only about land, serfs, duties and tithes. As we read Widukind's chronicle, we can see his great involvement in writing about St. Vitus and the protection with which the youth surrounded Saxony. At the same time the author writes absolutely nothing about St. Maurice, who by that time had become the main patron of the Empire, although the chronicle was dedicated to Otto I's daughter. The author was a monk in Corvey, a monastery which had held St. Vitus' mortal remains since the times of Louis the Pious. The matter is clear: the fame of the head of the Theban Legion eclipsed that of the patron of Corvey. In such a situation the founding of the Metropolitan see of Magdeburg, with Maurice as its patron, would become another tribute paid to the saint. This was unacceptable to Widukind and his monastery.

Hrotsvitha of Gandersheim reasoned along similar lines. In the 970s she wrote a piece devoted to the history of her monastery. She argued in it that it was thanks to the foundation of the abbey and the piety of its nuns that the House of Liudolfing could achieve their political glories, including the imperial crown.[43] Thus the ruling royal family owed everything to the Gandersheim Abbey and nothing to St. Maurice and the Magdeburg foundation. The piece was written when the archbishopric in question had already been erected. It is easy to imagine what the poetess thought about Otto I's plans at a time when the establishment of the archbishopric was debated. In any case, in her *Gesta Ottonis*—a work written in the 960s and describing the emperor's reign—she mentioned neither Maurice nor Magdeburg.

Yet higher matters were at stake in all of this as well. The monarch's plans, which he formulated on his own, concerning the founding of a new church province and closely associated with missionary projects, caused irritation

---

43   Roman Michałowski, *Princeps fundator. Studium z dziejów kultury politycznej w Polsce X– XIII wieku* (Warsaw: Arx Regia. Ośrodek Wydawniczy Zamku Królewskiego w Warszawie, 1993), 13–18.

in the Ottonian episcopate. German bishops, especially Archbishop William, were not quite willing to agree to such independence.[44] They were convinced that the ruler interfered in strictly ecclesiastical affairs in a manner that was too unceremonious and failed to take into account the opinion of the clergy. The Ottonian system of the Imperial Church was only in its infancy and not everyone had reconciled themselves to the new reality yet.

In such circumstances the resistance could not be overcome by the friendliness of Agapetus II or the compliance of John XII, who in 962 even issued a founding bull for Magdeburg. Progress was made in the matter only by a synod held in Ravenna at Easter 967 which decided the founding of the archbishopric and after which John XIII's founding bull was issued. It was soon followed by protection bulls for Quedlinburg, Gandersheim and Nordhausen. The queen mother's and her nuns' concern about the future of their monasteries was assuaged. However, the matter was by no means finished, because William and Bernard did not withdraw their protest. More than a year had to pass before in October the following year, after the death of the two bishops, the new Archbishop of Mainz, Hatto, and the new Bishop of Halberstadt, Hildewald, gave their consent (the latter's consent was most likely forced and was not expressed in writing). John XIII waited until that moment to give the pallium to the first Archbishop of Magdeburg, Adalbert.

It is quite understandable that in such circumstances the imperial-papal camp formulated broad ideological arguments. The objective was to demonstrate that from the point of view of religion, the founding of the archbishopric in question was justified in all respects. I shall come back to this issue later. In the context of the present reflections what matters is one question: was it a problem, in the debate surrounding the new foundation, that Magdeburg was not a Roman city and that the local Church had not been established by the Apostles?

Two sources attract our attention here. One is John XIII's foundation bull and the other—a *notitia* (the so-called *Narratio erectionis ecclesie Magdeburgensis*) containing an account of the 967 synod and of the events from the following year. Let us begin with the latter.[45]

---

44   Georg Kretschmar, "Der Kaiser tauft. Otto der Grosse und die Slawenmission," in *Bleibendes im Wandel der Kirchengeschichte. Kirchenhistorische Studien*, ed. Bernd Moeller and Gerhard Ruhbach (Tübingen: Mohr, 1973), 141–142; Odilo. Engels, "Die Gründung der Kirchenprovinz Magdeburg und die Ravennater 'Synode' von 968," *Annuarium Historiae Conciliorum* 7 (1975): 136–158, especially 158.

45   *Urkundenbuch des Erzstifts Magdeburg*, vol. 1, ed. Friedrich Israël and Walter Möllenberg, Geschichtsquellen der Provinz Sachsen und des Freistaates Anhalt, Neue Reihe, 18

The author of the document indicates the reasons why a new metropolitan see should be erected. There was an urgent pastoral need for it. A great multitude of Slavs had converted to Christianity and required loving spiritual care because there was a danger that they might otherwise abandon the Christian religion. On the other hand, there was an appropriate place where the seat of an archbishopric could be established. That place was Magdeburg, situated on the very border of Slavdom, "ubi isdem serenissimus cesar civitatem mirifice fundavit, populi multitudinem adunavit, ecclesias construxit plurimorumque martirum beati scilicet Mauritii et Innocentii aliorumque corpora transtulit canonicosque inibi deo famulantes constituit, ad quorum victum et ecclesie utilitatem castra, villas, predia et decimas cum universis adiacentiis affluenter ex proprio concessit".[46]

We could conclude that a prerequisite for an archbishopric to be established in Magdeburg was that it was a real city: populous, full of churches, relics of saints and well-endowed ecclesiastical institutions. At the same time, however, the author of the account admits in passing that this *civitas* had not emerged in Antiquity, founded as it was by Otto I.

There is no doubt that people in Magdeburg realized this problem and that some of them did not want to get used to such an interpretation of history. They tried to convince themselves and others that, contrary to some opinions, the metropolitan see on the Elbe had not been founded in recent past but in Antiquity, emerging straight away as an important centre. This was the objective of the anonymous author of *Gesta archiepiscoporum Magdeburgensium*.

Obviously, he had to devote much attention to the work of Otto I. He portrayed him as a man who had laid new foundations for the city of Magdeburg.[47] The historiographer did not claim that the German monarch had founded the city but rather that he had renewed the foundation. Rejecting the vision of history accepted by the synod's fathers, he regarded Caesar as the founder of Magdeburg. Here was—he says—Aeneas' all-powerful descendant, who, after conquering all Gaul, organized a military expedition to the east and, to

---

(Magdeburg: Selbstverlag der Landesgeschichtlichen Forschungsatelle, 1937), no. 61, 83–88. See Engels, "Die Gründung der Kirchenprovinz Magdeburg," passim.

46   *Urkundenbuch des Erzstifts Magdeburg*, no. 61, 84 ("where the serene emperor himself miraculously founded the city, brought together a multitude of people, built churches and translated the relics of many martyrs, namely of Saints Maurice and Innocent and others. He ordained canons there in the service of God, and he granted to them, from his own property, castles, manors, farms, and tithes, along with all other pertinences in the region, for their sustenance and the use of the churches").

47   *Gesta Archiepiscoporum Magdeburgensium*, ed. Wilhelm Schum, MGH SS, vol. 14 (Hanover: Hahn, 1883), cap. 4, 377.

subjugate his new dominion, ordered many cities to be built and had them fortified. Some even received masonry fortifications. Magdeburg was by no means the least important among them. It was founded by Caesar to honour Diana, because it was to the protection of this goddess that he had entrusted the success of his expedition. He also founded in the city a temple dedicated to Diana and brought there a large group of virgins. This is why the city on the Elbe is called Magdeburg.[48]

The readers can thus learn that it was a Roman city and a city that in Antiquity played a significant role in both the secular and the religious sphere. In this way it fulfilled Pseudo-Isidore's requirements for an important ecclesiastical see. Of that the medieval cleric could be certain.

The story I have just quoted was written down in the 12th century, though it may already have been known in the late 10th or at the beginning of the 11th century. Some medievalists have suspected that a piece devoted to the beginnings of the Archbishopric of Magdeburg was written during the reigns of the Ottonians or Conrad II. It has not survived to this day, but the 12th-century author quoted above must have drawn extensively on it. This hypothesis, disregarded for many years,[49] was defended by Helmut Beumann, who convincingly demonstrated the existence of such a work.[50] Of course, there is no evidence of Caesar and the Romans being mentioned in this lost piece. It is probable, though,[51] if we take into account the fact that Thietmar—an author educated in Magdeburg and long-time canon at the local cathedral—put forward a similar thesis for Merseburg. The Romans had been there as well and the house of Romulus had erected there a temple, this time dedicated to Mars. The whole reasoning was based—in this case too—on the etymology of the name of the city, allegedly deriving from the name of the deity.[52] Another author who resorted to etymologizing was the author of the *Life of St. Adalbert 1*. He believed—of course—that "Magdeburg" meant "a city of virgins". He himself probably did not study in the city, but he presented a biography of someone

---

48   Ibid., cap. 2, 377.

49   Wilhelm Wattenbach and Robert Holzmann, *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen im Mittelalter. Die Zeit der Sachsen und Salier*, vol. 1: *Das Zeitalter des Ottonischen Staates (900–1050)*, ed. Franz-Josef Schmale (Weimar: Böhlau, 1967), 66.

50   Helmut Beumann, "Laurentius und Mauritius. Zu den missionspolitischen Folgen des Ungarnsieges Ottos des Grossen," in *Festschrift für Walter Schlesinger*, ed. Helmut Beumann, vol. 1, Mitteldeutsche Forschungen 74/II (Cologne and Vienna: Böhlau, 1974), 261–264; idem, *Theutonum nova metropolis*, 217–228 and passim.

51   Beumann claimed categorically that this was indeed the case (Beuman, *Theutonum nova metropolis*), 208, 215–216.

52   Thietmar, lib. I, cap. 2, 5.

who had, deriving his information from Adalbert's brother Gaudentius, who went to the same schools as the Bishop of Prague.[53]

However, irrespective of whether the hypothesis concerning the Roman origins of the city was known in the late 10th and early 11th century, it left no trace in documents from the Ottonian period. On the contrary, the documents claim emphatically and consistently that Magdeburg was founded by Otto I. This was how the matter was presented at the Ravenna synod, a fact evidenced by the account quoted above, and by two papal documents—one genuine[54] and one false. Interestingly, a draft of the bull forged around 1004 states categorically that Otto built the city from scratch.[55]

It thus turns out that in reliable Roman as well as imperial circles there was no doubt that the city in question did not have ancient roots. If people living in the city on the Elbe in the 10th and early 11th century seriously considered the thesis according to which their city had been built by the Romans, they did not invoke this fact in public discussions. It would seem that Magdeburg's intellectual circles faced a dilemma: if the view concerning ancient origins of the city were to be promoted, this would undermine the thesis that Otto I was like Constantine the Great. For in order to make a convincing comparison between the two, it had to be demonstrated that the German ruler, too, had founded a magnificent capital. As it will soon turn out, the thesis in question, very much

---

53   *S. Adalberti Vita I*, cap. 3, 6.

54   See e.g. *Papsturkunden*, vol. 1, no. 190, 375. On the other hand, worthy of note is Benedict VII's bull for Archbishop Gisiler of 26 April 983, a document regarded by the last editor as a forgery fabricated by Gisiler himself (*Papsturkunden*, vol. 1, no. †280, 547–548). It contains the following preamble: "Si ęcclesias Dei, quę in locis, ubi antiquitus constructę sunt, a noviter nostris temporibus construuntur, apostolica et canonica auctoritate, quod nostri officii est, privilegii nostri donatione exaltamus et confirmamus, id procul dubio nobis spiritualiter et carnaliter profuturum esse credimus" (548) ("If God's Churches are now in our own time rebuilt in places where they had been constructed in antiquity, we exalt and confirm them by the donation of our privilege by means of the canonical and apostolic authority that is vested in our office, we believe that this will without doubt be to our spiritual and corporal benefit"). It mentions a church that has existed for a long time and is now being rebuilt. Perhaps, then, we see here the germs of the idea that the Magdeburg Church began in ancient times. This is a probable but not the only possible interpretation. The bull concerns the handing over to Gisiler of the St. Lawrence's Monastery in Merseburg, a former cathedral. A question, therefore, arises: when writing about churches built long time ago, did the pope mean the Magdeburg cathedral or the Merseburg monastery? The second interpretation seems to be more plausible, given the fact that it is the Merseburg church that is to be built anew: it used to be the seat of a bishopric and now begins to be a Benedictine abbey.

55   *Papsturkunden*, vol. 2, no. †412, 783.

liked by the Magdeburg clerics and those supporting them, was also supported
by opinions officially voiced by the Holy See.

A fairly new city and a lack of ecclesiastical roots of ancient origin—all
this created a situation which had to be addressed somehow. Attempts to do
so are manifested in the foundation bull issued by John XIII on 22 April 967,
publishing the decisions of the Ravenna synod.[56] In it the pope states that he
erects the Archbishopric of Magdeburg and that he does so by the authority of
St. Peter and the same powers that were used by his predecessors in founding
Constantinople. In addition, by the same authority he grants the new arch-
bishopric a privilege because of which it will not be inferior to other metro-
politan sees, but will be the first among firsts and just as ancient as the most
ancient seats of archbishoprics. John explains the reasons of this extraordinary
generosity. He points to the fact that Otto I, as the third ruler after Constantine,
has rendered great service to the Roman Church.[57]

It is an extraordinary fragment and for this reason it has long attracted
scholars' attention.[58] For does it really imply that the popes established

---

56   *Papsturkunden*, vol. 1, no. 177, 347–348.

57   "Nos vero eius [sc. Ottonis I] in Dei servicio ita mirifice detentum mirantes conivere ei
      dignum duximus, statuentes presente et consentiente sancta sindo et ipso inperatore,
      ut Magdaburgh sita iuxta Albiam fluvium, ubi ipse a Deo benedictus inperator corpus
      sancti Mauricii cum multis martiribus collocaverat et mire magnitudinis ęcclesiam con-
      struxerat, deinceps metropolis sit et nominetur auctoritate beati Petri apostolorum prin-
      cipis et ea qua predecessores nostri Constantinopolim statuerunt. Ideo, quia filius noster
      saepe iam nominatus Otto, omnium augustorum augustissimus inperator, tercius post
      Constantinum, maxime Romanam ęcclesiam exaltavit, concessimus, ut non posterior
      sit cęteris urbibus metropolitanis, sed cum primis prima et cum antiquis antiqua incon-
      vulsa permaneat"—ibid., 348 ("Indeed we ourselves, marvelling at his [i.e. Otto's] remark-
      able preoccupation in the service of God thought it appropriate to collaborate with
      him and decree (with the consent of the present synod and the emperor himself) that
      Magdeburg—located on the banks of the river Elbe, where the emperor himself (blessed
      by God) translated the body of Saint Maurice along with many martyrs and built a church
      of remarkable size—should hereafter be and enjoy the title of metropolis; this we decree
      by the authority of Saint Peter, leader of the apostles, and by that authority by which
      our predecessors established Constantinople. Therefore, since our son—the already oft-
      named Otto, most august Emperor of all, third after Constantine—has greatly exalted
      the Roman church, we grant that [the see of Magdeburg] should not be inferior to other
      metropolitan cities, but rather should remain unharmed as the first among the first, and
      ancient among the ancient").

58   See e.g. Werner Ohnsorge, "Die Anerkennung des Kaisertums durch Byzanz," *Byzantinische
      Zeitschrift* 54 (1961): 28–52, especially 33–35; Helmut Beumann, "Das Kaisertum Ottos des
      Grossen. Ein Rückblick nach tausend Jahren" (1st edition 1962), in idem, *Wissenschaft vom*

Constantinople? The Donation of Constantine—a document very dear to medieval popes' hearts—clearly states that it was the emperor and not the Bishop of Rome that founded the city in question. That is why the analysed fragment should be understood as saying that the local Church was raised by the popes to the high rank of a patriarchate. We are most likely dealing here with a reference to Pseudo-Isidore. According to the canonist forger, "prime" Churches (*primates*) are those that had the status of *primates* in ancient times and whose status after the birth of Christ was confirmed by papal authority.[59] This means that ancient origins of a city, although necessary, were in themselves not sufficient for a local Church to have the right to primacy or to be regarded as a patriarchate. This had to be sanctioned by Rome.

Thus, Constantinople's status stemmed not from the Apostolicity of the local bishopric, not from the work of St. Andrew the Apostle,[60] but from papal privileges, which could be but did not have to be granted by the pontiffs. What an affront to the Greeks!

In any case, it seems that John XIII did indeed refer to Pseudo-Isidore, but interpreted him one-sidedly. In the 960s the *Constitutum Constantini*, which was, in fact, part of the above mentioned collection of canon laws, enjoyed high standing in Rome. There was even a copy of the Donation in letters of gold made in the Curia. As we read the document, we may have the impression that Constantine the Great founded Constantinople *in cruda radice*.[61] If so, the

---

Mittelalter, 450–455; Wolfgang Ullmann, "Magdeburg, das Konstantinopel des Nordens. Aspekte von Kaiser- und Papstpolitik bei der Gründung des Magdeburger Erzbistums" *Jahrbuch für die Geschichte Mittel- und Ostdeutschlands* 21 (1972): 1–4; Fuhrmann, *Einfluss*, vol. 2, 393–396; Beumann, "Laurentius und Mauritius," 250–251; Engels, "Metropolit oder Erzbischof," 277.

59   "Quod non aliae metropolitanae ecclesiae vel primates sint, nisi ille quae prius primates erant et post Christi adventum auctoritate apostolica et sinodali primatum habere meruerunt. Reliquae vero non primates, sed metropoles vocentur, eorumque episcopi non primatum sed aut metropolitanorum aut archiepiscoporum nomine fruantur"—cap. 12, *Decretales Pseudo-Isidorianae*, 468–469. See Fuhrmann, *Einfluss*, vol. 2, 393–396 ("There should be no other metropolitan or primate churches, except for those which were earlier primate churches and after the advent of Christ were deemed worthy to maintain their primacy by spostolic and synodal authority. The rest should be called not primate churches, but metropolitans, and their bishops should use the title not of primates, but of metropolitans or archbishops").

60   Dvornik, *The Idea of Apostolicity*, Chapters 6 and 7, and passim.

61   "Unde congruum prospeximus nostrum imperium et regni potestatem orientalibus transferri ac transmutari regionibus et in Bizantiae provintia in obtimo loco nomini nostro civitatem aedificari et nostrum illic constitui imperium [...]"—*Decretales Pseudo-Isidorianae*, 254 ("Therefore we discerned it to be fitting to transfer and shift our empire

city on the Bosphorus did not have its origins in pagan and Apostolic times, and, as such, did not belong to the oldest local Churches. It could, therefore, be said that its situation was similar to that of Magdeburg. Yet the pope did raise it to the rank of patriarchate. The Roman theologians surrounding John XIII adopted Isidore's idea whereby the Holy See had the authority to grant the highest honours to cities, but at the same time they attributed an absolute meaning to this idea. The pope did not have to slavishly follow the principle according to which primacy or status of patriarchate were to be bestowed solely on those cities that had occupied a very high position in administration already before the birth of Christ. The principle could be waived in exceptional situations. This happened when the Bishop of Rome founded the Archbishopric of Magdeburg.

Another question now arises: Why does John XIII invoke not only the authority of St. Peter but also the power by which popes "established" Constantinople? The incumbent Bishop of Rome does two things here: he erects a new ecclesiastical province and makes it equal to the oldest archbishoprics. Whereas the founding of a new province was a routine action, as it were, perfectly in line with commonly accepted prerogatives of the Holy See, in the latter case we are dealing with something unique, something that requires a special explanation. For it was not an ordinary matter to consider a newly-established archbishopric to be as old as the oldest ecclesiastical sees. This special explanation, to which the author of the bull refers, should be understand as follows: if popes have sufficient authority to elevate the city on the Bosphorus to the rank of one of the five most important sees in the world, although its origins were not in pagan and Apostolic times, they also have the authority to make Magdeburg equal to the finest metropolitan sees.

The document mentions Constantine's name. It, too, is to serve as an argument. By referring to the first Christian emperor, John XIII tries to explain why he wants to surround Magdeburg with such great splendour. If Otto I's merits are comparable to those of the first Christian emperor, the reward must be comparable too. Constantine's reward was the status of patriarchate for Constantinople, for the German ruler—making his foundation the equal of the first and oldest metropolitan churches in the world.

We have to admit that John XIII's argumentation was ingenious. In a way, he was forced to adopt such a stance, because the hierarchy of local Churches, as it was perceived at the time, depended on how long they had existed and how long their sees had existed. The world's reasoning went along the lines

---

and the seat of our kingdom to the eastern regions and to build a city in our name at the best place in the Byzantine province and to establish our empire there").

proclaimed by Pseudo-Isidore, even if not everyone read that compilation. The pope did not question these principles; on the contrary—he seemed to embrace them. After all, he agreed that the finest ecclesiastical sees were the oldest sees. The argumentation used in the document consisted in accepting these principles, but neutralizing them temporarily at the same time.

However, the efforts undertaken by the Holy See with, undoubtedly, Otto I's backing behind them show how highly the local Churches with proven ancient origins were appreciated in that period. When an archbishopric could not boast such origins, this caused mental discomfort.

I have written earlier that the plans to establish a metropolitan see in Magdeburg met with opposition or even hostility on the part of some figures. This is the background against which we should examine John XIII's unusual argumentation. Its objective must have been not so much to make the foundation of the archbishopric happen—the matter was settled given the emperor's determination—but to raise the archbishopric's authority as high as possible, once the see had been established. There was a risk that the new province, which many influential figures in Saxony and Rheinland simply did not want, would enjoy such small prestige that it would be difficult for the metropolitan to operate effectively. What also mattered was ensuring a worthy place for him among the German archbishops. It must have been intolerable for Otto I to think that the head of the archbishopric established by him would be snubbed in the German episcopate.

John XIII's argumentation had some unexpected consequences as well. As a result of the papal privilege making Magdeburg equal to the most venerable and the oldest local Churches, the see began to compete with Mainz and Trier. Each of the two sees sought primacy in Germany. However, was any primacy possible given the fact that Magdeburg was equal to the best?

Nevertheless, people in Magdeburg remembered very well that the local archbishopric was freshly created and this awareness was the cause of some concern. John XIII's privilege did not dispel all anxieties, so additional solutions had to be found. In a bull by John XIX—probably authentic, though quite often disputed[62]—the author admits that the Archbishopric of Magdeburg is indeed younger than others, but on the other hand is closer to the Church of Rome, because it is more like it. At this point, referring vaguely to custom-based analogies, the author points to specific organizational forms of canons,

---

62   Helmut Beumann tries to demonstrate, by means of some noteworthy arguments, that we are dealing here with an authentic bull in: *Theutonum nova metropolis*, 200–202. The position of previous researchers is reported by the last editor of the bull in *Papsturkunden*, vol. 2, no. 567, 1073–1074, also arguing for the authenticity of the document.

which are the same in Magdeburg and in Rome, alluding to cardinals saying offices at St. Maurice's altar.[63] This similarity prompts the pope to confirm the privileges of the ecclesiastical province on the Elbe.

Leaving aside the question of colleges of cardinals in the German Church, let us only note the significance ascribed to the existence of such a college by the person dictating the document in question. This was an argument that was to weigh in favour of Magdeburg, when the archbishopric could not boast ancient origins. It is not the link to the beginnings of Christianity that is really important—explained the local cleric—but the link to the Church of Rome as it was at that moment, that is, a bond manifested, for example, in the similarity of customs and institutions.

What a different meaning the college of cardinals had in Trier! In a 975 bull, regarded by some scholars as a forgery, Benedict VII grants Archbishop Theodoric a range of honorary and liturgical privileges. In this context he lists the right to wear dalmatics by cardinal-priests and sandals by deacons. What is interesting is his justification. The Archbishopric of Trier is entitled to all these honours, because so is the Archbishopric of Ravenna. The premise of this syllogism is as follows. Both Churches were founded by a disciple of St. Peter: St. Apollinaris in the case of Ravenna and St. Eucharius in the case of Trier. That is why both archbishoprics should have the same rights. This means that in this particular case the greatness of the German archbishopric was ultimately based on its link to the past. It was in communion with Rome, but with Rome existing at the beginning of Christianity, personified by St. Peter himself, and not by his successor. In other words—the value of the local Church stemmed from the fact that it emerged at the dawn of Christianity and that it was established by a disciple of St. Peter, whom the Apostle chose, ordained and sent to the pagan people in question.[64]

---

63   "[…] archiepiscopatus ipse [sc. Magdaburgensis], quamvis circa se positis iunior est tempore, tamen ęcclesię Romanę vicinior est ęqualitate, quoniam et institutionis eadem regula et canonicorum ordinum nobis et ipsis idem est habitus et liquido eorum forma ad nostri similitudinem est expressa […]"—*Papsturkunden*, vol. 2, no. 567, 1074 ("The archdiocese [of Magdeburg], although it is younger in age than those around it, is nevertheless more equal to the church of Rome, since the rule of its institution is the same as that of ours, and the nature and of the orders of their canons and our [?] canons are the same, and their form is evidently shaped in the likeness of ours").

64   "Et quoniam eiusdem ęcclesię [sc. Treuerensis] archipresulem, beatum Eucharium videlicet, a beato Petro apostolorum principe novimus ordinatum, sicut et beatum Apollinarem Rauenne civitatis, placuit nobis eidem fratri nostro Theodorico, sanctę Treuerensis ęcclesiae archiepiscopo, cunctisque per eum successoribus suis pemittere, quatinus, sicut in unius beati Petri scilicet apostoli ordinatione, benedictione, directione gentibus

The facts that have just been presented justify the following conclusions. In the early Middle Ages a highly treasured ideology was one which considered Churches with an Apostolic tradition to be particularly valuable. If such a bishopric had its seat in a Roman city which had played an important role in Antiquity, this was its additional claim to glory. It must be stressed that this ideology was important not only to erudite people and hagiographers. On the contrary, it was very seriously treated also by princes of the Church and politicians. They wanted the history of their own see to emphasize these threads as much as possible. They encouraged scholars to carry out studies in this respect and to present their results. They spared no expense either whenever there emerged an opportunity to present the history of their bishoprics in the language of fine arts. Above all, however, they tried to turn the glory of the history of their own Church into concrete forms. This included placing a given bishopric within the hierarchy of bishoprics, as well as prerogatives, which were not always purely honorary.

There were, of course, outstanding sees that could not boast an Apostolic and a Roman past. Such was the fate of, first of all, Churches founded in the former *barbaricum*. Yet this does not mean that they could ignore the above mentioned ideology and, indeed, they did not. The local elites often tried to amplify the history of their bishoprics. They were not always successful. In such cases they would embark on an ideological offensive in order to strengthen their authority on the basis of other, readily available values.

─────────

ad predicandum Christi evanelium ambarum civitatum predicatores ęquales extiterant, ita in missarum sollemnis celebrandis, in eqitando cum nacco per stationes et in omni honore ęquales existant, crux ante eundem, sicut et ante Rauennatem archipresulem, ubiubi geratur. Cardinales quoque presbiteri fratre nostro Theodorico missam celebrante dalmaticis et diaconi una cum presbiteris sandaliis utantur, ebdomadariis quoque presbiteris ad sanctum Petrum missam celebrantibus suae dilectionis intuitu dalmaticis uti permittimus"—*Papsturkunden*, vol. 1, no. 468, 469–470 ("And since we know that the arch-prelate of the same church, namely Saint Eucharius, was ordained by Saint Peter, leader of the apostles (just as was also Saint Apollinaris of Ravenna), it finds favour with us to grant to our own brother Theodoric, archbishop of the holy church if Trier, and to all of his successors through him, that the cross should be carried everywhere before him, just as it is before the arch-prelate of Ravenna. This we grant just as by the ordination, blessing, and direction of Saint Peter alone the preachers of both cities were equal in preaching the gospel of Christ to the peoples, and so also are equal with regard to all honours, and in respect of celebrating the mass and riding on a horse-cloth between residences. Furthermore, when our brother Theodoric is celebrating mass, the cardinals and priests should wear dalmatics, and the deacons and priests should wear sandals; the priests and hebdomadarians celebrating mass at the altar of Saint Peter we allow to wear dalmatics in consideration of Theodoric's love").

Apostolic and Roman origins of the local Church—these were very important components of early medieval ideology. But they were not the only ones. The analysis should, therefore, be expanded and I will do this by analyzing three examples: of Salzburg, Passau and Benevento.

3   The Example of Salzburg

Christianity reached the lands that would later become part of Bavaria in Antiquity owing to the fact that much of this territory belonged to the Roman Empire.[65] However, no diocesan organization developed in the region at the time. Only in Lorch, in the south-eastern part of medieval Bavaria, did a bishopric emerge and function for some time. The fall of the Empire did not lead to a collapse of Christianity in the Upper Danube and Iser area. The Latin

---

[65]   The beginnings of the ecclesiastical organization in Bavaria and the origins of the Archbishopric of Salzburg are discussed extensively and interestingly in the literature. I shall mention only those publications from which I have benefited most: for an overview of the problem, see Brigitte Wavra, *Salzburg und Hamburg. Erzbistumsgründung und Missionspolitik in karolingischer Zeit*, Osteuropa Studien der Hochschulen des Landes Hessen. Reihe I. Giessener Abhandlungen zur Agrar- und Wirtschaftsforschung des europäischen Ostens 179 (Berlin: Duncker and Humblot, 1991), especially 35–200; Herwig Wolfram provides much interesting information and presents it in a highly informative manner in *Salzburg, Bayern, Österreich. Die Conversio Bagoariorum et Carantanorum und die Quellen ihrer Zeit*, Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschun. Ergänzungsband 31 (Vienna and Munich: Oldenbourg, 1995), passim; for information about the earliest period, see Jerzy Strzelczyk, *Iroszkoci w kulturze średniowiecznej Europy* (Warsaw: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy, 1987), 164–172, 209–228; Lothar Kolmer, "Regensburg oder Salzburg? Die Christianisierung der Bayern und die Errichtung kanonischer Bistümer," in *1200 Jahre Erzbistum Salzburg. Die älteste Metropole im deutschen Sprachraum*, ed. Heinz Dopsch, Peter F. Kramml, and Alfred Stefan Weiss, Mitteilungen der Gesellschaft für Salzburger Landeskunde, 18. Ergänzungsband = Salzburger Studien. Forschungen zu Geschichte, Kunst und Kultur, 1 (Salzburg: Gesellschaft für Salzburger Landeskunde, 1999), 9–20; for an analysis of the issues connected with the founding of the Archbishopric of Salzburg, see Herwig Wolfram, "Arn von Salzburg und Karl der Grosse", in ibid., 21–32; Egon Boshof, "Salzburg und Köln. Die ältesten noch bestehenden Metropolitanverbände im deutschen Sprachraum", in ibid., 61–86, especially 61–67. Dariusz Andrzej Sikorski, "Biskupstwa zakładane przez Anglosasów na kontynencie w VIII w.—aspekty prawne," in *Nihil superflluum esse. Studia z dziejów średniowiecza ofiarowane Profesor Jadwidze Krzyżaniakowej*, ed. Jerzy Strzelczyk and Józef Dobosz (Poznań: Instytut Historii Uniwersytetu Adama Mickiewicza, 2000), 50–52.

population, cultivating its attachment to the Christian faith, survived here and there, and the Bavarii, who arrived in the 6th century, quickly began to adopt that religion. This can be confirmed without any doubt with regard to the Agilolfing dynasty. The Bavarian princess Theodelinda, who married the Lombard king Authari (d. 591) and then, after his death, King Agilulf (d. 615/616), was an ardent supporter of Catholicism in her new homeland. Her attitude was contrary to that of her subjects. The Lombards, if we discount the paganism that was still practised, were largely Arian.

The importance of Christianity in the life of Bavaria Christianity remains debatable between the 6th century and the beginning of the 8th. One thing is clear, however: an ecclesiastical organization in the full meaning of the term did not exist in the region. There might have been priests here and there who celebrated mass and administered sacraments, there might have even been occasional *episcopi vagantes* of Aquitainian, Irish or Frankish origin. However, there were no bishoprics with their own seats and boundaries.

There is good evidence of the work of foreign bishops during the reign of Duke Theodo (d. 717/718). Three of them deserve to be mentioned: Emmeram, who resided in Regensburg, Corbinian of Freising and Rupert. All were proclaimed saints after their deaths and became part of the legend of the Bavarian Church. We should be particularly interested in Rupert. Related to the Merovingians on the one side and to the Agilolfings on the other, he was bishop of Worms. In 696 or shortly before that he arrived in Bavaria invited by the above mentioned ruler, a relation of his, and settled in Salzburg. A dozen or so years later he returned to his mother diocese, where he died in 716 or slightly later. In 774 the body of the bishop and saint was brought to Salzburg and placed in a magnificent cathedral, which had just been built.

Rupert, like Emmeram and Corbinian, did not head a diocese in the full meaning of the term, a diocese with an officially recognized seat and boundaries. Such dioceses, as we know, simply did not exist in Bavaria at the time. Rupert was a bishop to whom the Monastery of St. Peter in Salzburg was subordinated. Above all, however, he carried out intense pastoral work, trying to raise the quality of religious life in the south-eastern corner of Bavaria. The local population was certainly Christian, but its Christianity was rather crude.

Duke Theodo came up with an initiative to establish a regular diocesan organization—comprising four bishoprics—in his country and obtained the Holy See's approval for his plan. Whether or not the plan was indeed implemented is a subject of some controversy. On the other hand, there is no doubt that Rupert did not become the Bishop of Salzburg in the end. As Theodo's plan was about to be implemented, Rupert had already returned to Worms.

Intense reforming activity was undertaken in Bavaria by Winfrid-Boniface, who used papal plenipotentiary powers. It is difficult to say with full conviction whether its significance consisted in the setting up of a network of bishoprics—they might have already existed—or whether the great Englishman only reformed the existing relations in accordance with the norms of ecclesiastical life as he imagined them. We can be certain of one thing: by the time St. Boniface's mission was coming to an end, Bavaria had a fully-fledged ecclesiastical organization comprising four dioceses: Regensburg, Passau, Salzburg and Freising.

No archbishopric was established, though, despite the fact that the Holy See had already recognized the necessity of establishing it in Duke Theodo's times. The Bavarian rulers displayed no special interest in this respect, believing that they themselves were able to guarantee unity for their Church. On the other hand, we have to bear in mind that the metropolitan organization, introduced into the Church in Antiquity, collapsed in many countries in the earliest Middle Ages. It virtually did not exist in the Frankish state in St. Boniface's times. Thus, what could have seemed to be an anomaly from the point of view of canon law, was, in fact, part of the actual order of things at the time.

The situation changed when Bavaria came under Carolingian rule. The Agilolfings were dethroned in 788, with Charlemagne coming to power. The monarch attached considerable weight to the restoration of the metropolitan organization within the vast territory of the Frankish kingdom and his efforts undertaken over many years eventually proved successful. In addition, he was the ruler who decided the foundation of the first Bavarian archbishopric. The setting up of a metropolitan organization in the eastern part of the empire stemmed, as we know, from general principles according to which the monarch organized ecclesiastical structures. However, some role was also played by another factor. When the Avar state was finally defeated in 796, this opened up an opportunity for Christianization of the lands situated in the Danube River basin and Charlemagne decided to seize it. In these circumstances the need to establish a frontier church province became obvious.

The Frankish king chose Salzburg to be the seat of the new archbishopric. This requires some comment, because the city was not the capital of Bavaria. From time immemorial the main political and residential centre had been in Regensburg, which maintained its position under Carolingian rule. The common belief was—and this view had been accepted since the 4th century at the latest—that there should be a correlation between the status of a city or town in the state order and its status in the church order. This was the point of view

represented by Gregory II. In his instructions concerning the rules that should be observed when creating a diocesan organization in Bavaria, the pope clearly stated that an archbishopric should be located in the most important metropolis in the country.[66]

Why then was it Salzburg and not Regensburg that became the seat of the Bavarian archbishopric? Scholars writing on the subject usually take into account the following factors. The Diocese of Salzburg had at its disposal a much richer endowment than the diocese in the capital city. Another important argument may have been the glorious past of the see in question. In 745–784 its bishop was Vergilius, undoubtedly an outstanding individual; in addition, over the decades the Salzburg Church had made a huge contribution to the Christianization of the Slavs, especially during Vergilius' pontificate. So if Charlemagne established the Bavarian church province with a view to evangelizing the pagans—which was indeed the case—the choice of Salzburg as its metropolitan see was logical. It is also worth noting that an important role may have been played here by the personality of the first Bishop of Salzburg who was raised to the rank of archbishop and by his ties to the court. The man in question was Arno.

He was Bavarian and was given the Salzburg see in 784 by Tassilo III, so he must have enjoyed his complete confidence. In any case, in 787 Arno headed a group of envoys whom the duke sent to Rome. They had a very important task to perform: to prevent a looming catastrophe. Charlemagne was planning to annex Bavaria and Tassilo, realizing the seriousness of the situation, tried to reach an acceptable *modus vivendi* with the Frankish king. He had illusory hopes for Pope Hadrian's mediation. The envoys' mission proved to be too difficult and the following year the duke lost both his throne and his freedom.

Interestingly, Arno was a man who was also close to Charlemagne. As early as 782 he became the abbot of the Monastery of Saint-Amand-les-Eaux, situated near today's French-Belgian border. The king of the Franks was the lord of the monastery, and the nomination would have been impossible without Charlemagne's full approval. Arno was among numerous Bavarian priests who rose to high ecclesiastical offices in the Frankish kingdom during the reign of this monarch.

It therefore comes as no surprise that the debacle of 788 did not undermine Arno's position. Further developments show how much Charlemagne trusted

---

66   *Litterae Gregorii II papae Decretales*, ed. Georg Heinrich Pertz, MGH Leges, vol. 3 (Hanover: Hahn,, 1863), cap. 3, 452.

him. On three occasions Arno was sent by the king to the Eternal City and
every time it was in connection with matters of national importance: in 797
the mission was to bring about an agreement between Leo III and the local
aristocracy; in 799 to restore Leo to the papal throne; and in 800 Arno accom-
panied Charlemagne on an expedition during which the Bishop of Rome was
finally cleared of all charges and the king of the Franks was crowned emperor.
Irrespective of the first two trips to Rome, Arno often served the Frankish king
as a *missus dominicus* and active participant in court and synodal assemblies.
When the monarch made his will, the archbishop served as a witness, signing
the document as the third dignitary present.[67]

We know quite a few details of the founding of the Archbishopric of
Salzburg, as the sources containing information about this subject are surpris-
ingly numerous, given their provenance in the early Middle Ages.[68] In addition
to a valuable passage from annals[69] we have at our disposal a series of papal
bulls addressed to Arno, Charlemagne and Bavarian bishops.[70] We can, there-
fore, easily reconstruct the course of events.

The Archbishopric of Salzburg was erected by a decision of Leo III, but the
decision was taken on the king's order. The pope himself did not hide this fact.
During his stay in the Eternal City, in late 797 and early 798, Arno personally
received the pallium and thus became the head of an ecclesiastical province
encompassing, in addition to its metropolitan see of Salzburg, Regensburg,
Freising, Passau, Säben/Brixen and Neuburg/Staffelsee.

The papal bulls issued in connection with this case enable us to work out
the circumstances which, according to the Holy See, justified the founding of
this ecclesiastical province. As was often the case in such situations, the docu-
ments mention the monarch's will, the relics kept in the church that was to
become the archbishop's seat as well as moral and intellectual qualifications
of the candidate for this high office. However, particularly stressed in Leo III's
bulls is the fact that Bavaria constitutes a province—created and organized

---

67   Heinz Dopsch, in *Geschichte Salzburgs*, vol. 1. issue 1, ed. Heinz Dopsch (Salzburg:
      Universitätsverlag Pustet, 1981), 165.

68   A complete list of sources is compiled by Wavra, *Salzburg und Hamburg*, 134–136.

69   *Annales ex annalibus Iuvavensibus antiquis excerpti*, ed. H. Bresslau, MGH Scriptores,
      vol. 30, 2 (Leipzig: Hahn, 1934), 736 (entries in *Annales Iuvavenses maximi* and in *Annales
      Iuvavenses maiores* under the year 798).

70   JE 2495, 2496, 2498, 2503—*Salzburger Urkundenbuch*, vol. 2: *Urkunden von 790–1199*,
      ed. (Salzburg: Gesellschaft für Salzburger Landeskunde, 1916), nos. 2a, 2b, 2c and 2d, 2–10.

by Charlemagne himself[71]—and that it is necessary for a secular province in which Christianity has flourished to become a church province as well.[72]

---

[71] "Dilectionis vestrae [i.e. Bavarian bishops mentioned by name], quas nobis petitorias emisistis syllabas, libenti suscepimus animo, in quibus ferebatur, ut in provincia vestra Baiovuariorum archiepiscopum ordinaremus. Quoniam provincia ipsa mirifice a filio nostro domno Carolo, excellentissimo rege Francorum et Langobardorum atque patricio Romanorum, pęnitus ex omni parte ordinata est, idcirco convenit nos ipso nempe moderamine in sacro ordine fideliter atque spiritaliter secundum canonicam censuram ipsam ordinare Baiouvariorum provinciam. Et quia deo auspice reperientes virum almificum et in scripturis divinis peritissimum et in omnibus misericordissimum spiritalibus moribus comprobatum, unacum consensu et voluntate filii nostri domni Caroli praecellentissimi magni regis vobis ordinavimus secundum sanctiones patrum archiepiscopum, videlicet Arnonem Iuuauensium, quę et Pętena nuncupatur, quę in honore beati Petri principis apostolorum venerabiliter est consecrata ibique requiescit corpus sacri pontificis Hruodberti unacum venerabilibus suis sodalibus scilicet Chunialdo atque Kyslario, quorum corpora ibidem a fidelibus honorantur" (JE 2495—*Salzburger Urkundenbuch*, no. 2c, 6.) ("We received with pleased spirit the beseeching letters of your love that you sent us, which say that we should ordain an archbishop in your province of the Bavarians. Since that province was so remarkably and comprehensively regulated in every way by our son, Lord Charles, the most excellent king of the Franks and Lombards and patrician of the Romans, it is certainly fitting for us therefore to create the [ecclesiastical] province of the Bavarians by the same measure, according to holy order, faithfully and religiously according to canonical judgement. Moreover, since by the auspices of God we have found a man renowned in sanctity, most learned in sacred scriptures, and proven to be most compassionate in all spiritual customs, with the consensus and approval of our son, Lord Charles, most excellent and great king, we have ordained for you, following the ordinances of the fathers, an archbishop, namely, Arno of Salzburg (also known as Petena). This city was reverently consecrated in honour of Saint Peter, leader of the apostles, and the body of the blessed bishop Huordbert along with his venerable companions, namely Chunialdus and Kyslarius, whose bodies are honoured by the faithful there").

[72] "Sicut enim a sanctorum patrum sancta catholica et apostolica Romana ęcclesia auctoritatem suscepit, ut in provincia, quę Deo auspice in Christianitatis more amplicata et dilatata est licentiam habeat eiusdem ecclesiae apostolicus et vicarius beati Petri apostolorum principis constituere metropolim et ordinare archiepiscopum, ita in partibus fecimus vestris," i.e. in the land of Bavarian bishops to whom Leo III sends the letter in question (JE 2503—*Salzburger Urkundenbuch*, vol. 2, no. 2d, 8) ("For just as the holy, catholic and apostolic Roman Church received its authority from that of the holy fathers so that the apostolic bishop of the same church and vicar of Saint Peter, leader of the apostles, should have licence, in the province where it has expanded and grown in the custom of Christianity, by God's grace, to create the metropolan see and ordain the archbishop, thus also we have acted in your lands").

Importantly, the elevation of Salzburg and its bishop was resisted by the Bavarian episcopate.[73] We can make such a conjecture on the basis of a report of a synod that took place in 799 or 800 in Reisbach. The documents are signed by the participants, with all bishops appearing in the order of the duration of their incumbency. Consequently, Arno's name appears only after that of Almo of Säben; moreover, it bears the title of bishop and not archbishop.[74] Another, very distinctive trace of rebellion is a bull by Leo III of 11 April 800 in which the pope demands that the Bavarian bishops be obedient to their metropolitan, emphasizing that it is necessary for the metropolitan to watch over them. Otherwise they might fall victim to Satanic designs. This is a tone that betrays the seriousness of the situation. The bull's author also refers to other arguments for the need to establish an ecclesiastical province in Bavaria, arguments he quoted in his previous bull (JE 2495).[75]

At this point we arrive at an issue which is of direct interest to us. The defiance of the new legal order on the part of the Bavarian Church forced the Salzburg clerics to defend their own positions. They did not bring themselves to write a treatise that would systematically present arguments for the right of St. Rupert's successors to receive the pallium. However, we do know for sure that they carefully analyzed the history of Salzburg, looking in it for relevant facts, and that they modified it appropriately.

Traces of these studies and manipulations can be found in the numerous documents that have survived to this day. From our point of view the following

---

73 Wavra, *Salzburg und Hamburg*, 135–136.

74 *Notitia Concilii Rispacensis*, MGH Concilia, ed. Albert Werminghoff, vol. 2: *Concilia aevi Carolini*, 1 (Hanover and Leipzig: Hahn, 1906), 215. See Wilfried Hartmann, *Die Synoden der Karolingerzeit im Frankenreich und Italien* (Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 1989), 142.

75 JE 2503—*Salzburger Urkundenbuch*, vol. 2, no. 2d, 7–10. See e.g. the following fragment: "Et idcirco convenit nos fratri nostro Arnoni archiepiscopo, cui vestri curam commisimus, cum magna constantia animi canonicis censuris docentes super vos vigilare, ut non lupinis morsibus id est diaboli stimulis laniemini sed magis liberati a prelato sanctissimo atque reverentissimo fratre nostro Arnone archiepiscopo necnon edocati diecti a diabolicis telis vestras sacratissimas animas lucrifaciente deo cum fructu boni operis pertingatis ad palmam" (pp. 7–8) ("And for this reason it seemed fitting to us and to our brother, archbishop Arno (to whom we have granted your guardianship), to provide instruction in canonical judgements and keep watch over you with great constancy of the mind, so that you are not torn apart by the wolf's biting (that is, by the urgings of the devil), but rather, freed and instructed by the most blessed prelate, our most reverent brother archbishop Arno, you, cast down by diabolic darts, extend your sacred souls to the palm of victory, to God's benefit, by means of the fruit of good works").

sources are particularly interesting: two lives of St. Rupert, two inventories of the archbishopric's property, as well as a historiographic work, *Conversio Bagoariorum et Carantanorum*.[76]

The oldest *vita* of St. Rupert, which, however, has not survived, was the so-called Vita X, which was written during the tenure of Vergilius, Bishop of Salzburg (745/746–784), most likely before 769 than later.[77] Of importance to the analyzed issue are two earliest surviving versions, Vita A and Vita B. The former was written by an anonymous author around 793, during Bishop Arno's pontificate.[78] Vita X is used extensively here, though with some changes and interpolations. The other version is an integral part of a work known as *Conversio Bagoariorum et Carantanorum*[79] and was written, like the entire work, in 870 in Salzburg, perhaps by Archbishop Adalwin himself.[80] We know that the historiographer used not Vita A, but the lost version X, to which he added some elements.

Both inventories were made during Arno's pontificate, with the first, dating from 788–790, being compiled by Deacon Benedict,[81] while the second—the so-called *Breves Notitiae*—was compiled between 798 and 800.[82] Both documents used the so-called *Libellus Virgilii*, i.e. a register of property and property rights of the Salzburg Diocese, commissioned at some point by Bishop Vergilius.

---

76 For information about these sources, see, first of all, Wolfram, *Salzburg, Bayern, Österreich*, 193–336, especially diagram on p. 228. The analysis below is based on the results of this study.

77 For information about hagiographic works concerning St. Rupert, see also Helmut Beumann, "Zur Textgeschichte der Vita Ruperti," in *Festschrift für Hermann Heimpel*, vol. 3, Veröffentlichungen des Max Planck-Instituts für Geschichte 36/III (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1972), 166–192.

78 It is the basis for an edition prepared by Wilhelm Levison, *Vita Hrodberti episcopi Salisburgensis*, ed. Wilhelm Levison, MGH Scriptores rerum Merovingicarum, vol. 6 (Hanover and Leipzig: Hahn, 1913), 157–162 (footnotes contain the variants appearing in later versions).

79 The latest edition: *Die Conversio Bagoariorum et Carantanorum und der Brief des Erzbischofs Theotmar von Salzburg*, ed. Fritz Lošek, MGH Studien und Texte 15 (Hanover: Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 1997), 90–134, Vita B as cap. 1, 90–98.

80 Such a view has recently been expressed by F. Lošek, who follows Herwig Wolfram (*Die Conversio*, 5–6).

81 *Notitia Arnonis*; I use here Fritz Lošek's edition, "Notitia Arnonis und Breves Notitiae. Die Salzburger Güterverzeichnisse aus der Zeit um 800: Sprachlich-historische Einleitung, Text und Übersetzung," *Mitteilungen der Gesellschaft für Salzburger Landeskunde* 130 (1990): 80–101.

82 *Breves Notitiae*, ibid., 102–166.

When going through these documents, I shall analyze the way in which early medieval Salzburg sources described the person and work of Bishop Rupert. I will devote particular attention to the changes in the saint's image over time. My main task will be to look for the causes of this evolution.

In the oldest of the sources, *Notitia Arnonis*, Rupert is mentioned as an *episcopus* and *confessor*, buried with his companions in Salzburg, and during his lifetime receiving donations for the Church from the Duke of Bavaria and founding a female monastery, of the Virgin Mary, and a male monastery, of St. Maximilian.[83] Deacon Benedict does not try—remaining faithful to the nature of his document—to carry out a more detailed analysis of the bishop's work. This gap is filled by Vita A, whose author presents, albeit briefly, a biography of the saint, focusing on the Bavarian period of his life.

Thus, we learn that when he was Bishop of Worms, Rupert came to Regensburg, invited by the local ruler, Theodo. Soon after that he began to urge him to live a Christian life, and to teach the Catholic faith. In addition, he converted the duke and other noblemen to the true faith and strengthened them in the holy religion.[84] When the duke allowed him to choose a place for himself and restore (*restaurare*) God's temples, he went on the Danube as far as Lorch, where he stayed, preaching the Word of God and healing many by the grace of the Lord.[85] He did not remain there long, though, but continued his journey on land, reaching first Wallersee, where he built (*construxit*) a church dedicated to St. Peter. However, the place he chose for himself was Salzburg, a city where many beautiful buildings had been erected in Roman times. The buildings had fallen into ruin since, and the city had been overgrown with trees. Wanting to establish an ecclesiastical seat there to win over souls, he began, under God's grace, to ask the duke to turn the place in question over to him. Theodo did not refuse; Rupert cleared the city, built (*aedificans*) a beautiful church dedicated to St. Peter, together with some monastic buildings, and made sure that divine service was performed with all due care.[86] From his homeland he brought twelve disciples as well as a virgin named Erentrude. He made her Abbess of

---

83   *Notitia Arnonis*, praef., cap. 1 (80–82), cap. 7 (92–94), cap. 8 (94).

84   *Vita Hrodberti*, cap. 4, 158: "Quem [sc. Ducem Theotonem] vir Domini mox coepit de christiana conuersatione ammonere et de fide catholica inbuere ipsumque uero et multos alios illius gentis nobiles uiros ad ueram Christi fidem conuertit et in sacra corroborauit religione" ("The man of God soon began to admonish him [Duke Theodo] about the Christian life and to fill him with the Catholic faith, and he converted him and many other noblemen of the same people to the true faith of Christ and strengthened them in the sacred religion").

85   Ibid., cap. 5, 159.

86   Ibid., cap. 6–7, 159–160.

the Monastery of the Virgin Mary, which he established in the upper castle. The hagiographer ends his work, noting that miracles happen constantly at the tomb of the confessor.[87]

Written a few years later, *Breves Notitiae* provides a different interpretation of some facts related to the work of the saint. The author claims that Rupert was the Christianizer of Bavaria. According to him, the bishop converted Theodo from paganism to Christianity and baptized him as well as other nobles in Bavaria.[88] Thinking along the same lines, he states that the duke granted Rupert the right to build churches.[89] Yet the author of Vita A does not present Theodo and his dignitaries as pagans, but, rather, as Christians whose faith needed to be purified and strengthened.[90] Consequently, the right granted by the ruler to the saint did not concern, in the hagiographer's view, the building of churches but their rebuilding. It seems, thus, that Christianity did exist in Bavaria, although Christians living there were far from perfect.

It is worth paying attention to another circumstance: the author of *Breves Notitiae* tries to convince the readers that Rupert was the founder of the Bishopric of Salzburg. The author of Vita A writes that with the duke's permission the saint looked for an appropriate place for himself in Bavaria and eventually found it in Salzburg, where he established an *ecclesiasticum officium*. Now we also learn that the bishop looked for an appropriate seat for a bishopric and that he found it in Salzburg.[91]

---

87 Ibid., cap. 10, 162.

88 *Breves Notitiae*, cap. 1, 102: "PRIMO igitur Theodo dux Baioariorum dei omnipotentis gratia instigante et Rudberto episcopo predicante de paganitate ad christianitatem conversus et ab eodem episcopo baptizatus est cum proceribus suis Baioariis" (Therefore first Theodo, Duke of the Bavarians, by the instigating grace of omnipotent God and the preaching of Bishop Rupert, was converted from heathdom to Christianity and was baptised by the same bishop along with the leading men of the Bavarians").

89 Ibid.: "Item Theodo dux dedit ei potestatem circuire regionem Bawariorum et eligere sibi locum ad episcopii sedem et ęcclesias construendas [. . .]" ("And Duke Theodo gave him the authority to travel around the territory of the Bavarians and choose for himself the place to establish the seat of the bishopric and build churches").

90 See Lošek, "Notitia Arnonis und Breves Notitiae," 26–27; Wolfram, *Salzburg, Bayern, Österreich*, 227, 233–234.

91 The author mentions this several times, e.g. in the fragment in footnote 89 quoted earlier. See also cap. 2, 102: "Non longe postea venit iam fatus Theodo dux ibidem et dedit domno et sancto Rudberto episcopo eundem locum [i.e. Salzburg] ad episcopii sedem [. . .]" ("Not long after this the afore-mentioned Duke Theodo came to the same place and gave the blessed lord Bishop Rupert the same place for the seat of his bishopric").

Finally, Vita B. As we read it, we are struck by three facts. The hagiographer abides by the claim from *Breves Notitiae* according to which Rupert was the Christianizer of Bavaria, but does it more emphatically. Whereas the author of *Breves Notitiae* claims that the bishop baptized the duke and his nobles, the author of *Conversio Bagoariorum* adds to that group the *ignobiles*, i.e. common people.[92] He also refers to the Christianization of the Bavarii in chapter 3 of *Conversio*, where we find the following passage: "Actenus praenotatum est, qualiter Bawarii facti sunt christiani seu numerus episcoporum et abbatum conscriptus in sede Iuvavensi".[93] Vita B constitutes chapter 1 of *Conversio Bagoariorum*, while chapter 2 deals with the work of Rupert's successors. The matter is thus clear: it is thanks to Rupert that the people of Bavaria accepted the Christian faith.

What is also striking is an interpolation in the description of the journey made by the bishop across Bavaria before he came to Salzburg. Until now the belief was that Rupert had gone on the Danube as far as Lorch and then turned towards Wallersee. Now the author claims that, having passed Lorch, Rupert went as far as the borders of Lower Pannonia, preaching the Word of God everywhere.[94]

The author of *Conversio Bagoariorum*, like the compiler of *Breves Notitiae*, maintains that Rupert founded the bishopric in Salzburg. From Vita A he has learned that the saint brought some disciples from Worms to the city, and adds that before returning to his homeland, the man of God appointed a successor in Salzburg.[95] On the other hand, in chapter 2 he states that after Rupert's death the Salzburg see was taken up by Vitalis, and lists all the bishops until Vergilius[96] and then, in subsequent chapters, all until Adalwin. We are dealing here with something more than just a statement concerning the founding

---

92 *Die Conversio Bagoariorum*, cap. 1, 92: "Quem [sc. ducem Theodonem] vir Domini cepit de christiana conversatione ammonere et de fide catholica imbuere; ipsumque non multo post et multos alios istius gentis nobiles atque ignobiles viros ad veram Christi fidem convertit sacroque baptismate regeneravit et in sancta corroboravit religione" ("The man of God began to admonish him [i.e Theodo] regarding the Christian life and fill him with the Catholic faith; he converted him, not long after, along with many other nobles and common men of the same people to the true faith of Christ and brought them forth again in holy baptism and strengthened them in the sacred religion").

93 100 ("It has thus far been noted how the Bavarians were made Christians, and the number of bishops and abbots recorded in the archdiocese of Salzburg").

94 Ibid., cap. 1, 92–94.

95 Ibid., cap. 1, 98.

96 Ibid., cap. 2, 98–100.

of the bishopric by Rupert. The historiographer expresses a conviction that, beginning with Vitalis, all the bishops were Rupert's successors.

When interpreting these facts, we need to immediately move *Conversio Bagoariorum et Carantanorum* out of sight as a source which is much later than the other ones. I will go back to this work in a moment.

In the early 790s the Salzburg clerics venerated Rupert, regarding him as a man to whom not only their city, but also the entire country owed a religious revival. They venerated Rupert as a holy bishop, who had distinguished himself mainly by his zealous and effective pastoral work. This is really the only topic developed in Vita A. The hagiographer writes nothing about his protagonist's ascetic life. He does mention miracles performed by the bishop *ante mortem*, but he does so rather perfunctorily and only in connection with the mission he undertook.[97] The miracles are mentioned only to emphasize the fact that Rupert was like an Apostle (the title is not mentioned in the text), that is, while travelling, he preached and healed the faithful, undoubtedly in a clear reference to the Gospel: "Et misit illos praedicare regnum Dei et sanare infirmos" (Mt 9, 1). True, the author touches upon the issue of God's grace surrounding the protagonist, but he does so only when he writes about his pastoral work: once when Rupert accepts Theodo's invitation to come to Bavaria and again when he asks the duke to give Salzburg to him.[98] This is how one-sided the message of the work is, focused as it is on just one idea.

But what the hagiographer writes about heavenly grace is highly significant also for another reason. It suggests that the author is convinced that God himself sent the bishop to work in Bavaria and then in Salzburg. Therefore, if the clerics associated with the local cathedral drew conclusions concerning their own mission from their patron's lifework—and this was undoubtedly the case—the mission had to be interpreted as one entrusted to them by supernatural forces.

In the last sentences of the work the author writes about the bishop's funeral and the miracles occurring at his tomb.[99] He does not mention the fact that Rupert died in Worms and that his body was not brought back to Salzburg until many years after his death. He must have known that fact, but he may not have wanted to make the situation more complicated. The presence of the saint's relics was a guarantee that the work of salvation started by Rupert in Salzburg would be continued there. Not for nothing did Pope Leo III,

97   *Vita Hrodberti*, cap. 5, 159.

98   Ibid., cap. 3, 158; cap. 7, 160.

99   Ibid., cap. 10, 162.

informing the bishops of the elevation of Arno's see to the rank of an archbishopric, point to the fact that St. Rupert's body was kept there.[100]

Vita A informs us how the life and merits of the patron were imagined a few years before the bishopric was elevated to the rank of a church province. Soon after that event there was some shift of focus, which we can discern in *Breves Notitiae*. Firstly, from that moment Rupert is unequivocally presented as the man who baptized Bavaria. Secondly, he is regarded as the founder and first Bishop of Salzburg. We cannot help but get the impression that we are dealing here with an attempt to overcome the Bavarian episcopate's reluctance to recognize the primacy of the Salzburg bishop.

The meaning of this "sharpening" of views may have been the following: if Rupert baptized the Bavarii, he was the spiritual father of all of them. One could even go a step further and claim that the Bishop of Worms was entrusted with the evangelization by the heavens themselves, for is it possible for an evangelizer successfully converting pagans to do it without God's grace, which is necessary for such a work? In addition, during his work in Bavaria Rupert not only settled in Salzburg, but—as people began to believe—founded a bishopric there and became its first bishop. This fact justified the conclusion that each Bishop of Salzburg was Rupert's successor and, consequently, inherited his dignity and could exercise the rights he had been granted; i.e. he was the spiritual father of all Bavarians and this gave his specific powers vis-à-vis other Bavarian dioceses. In such a situation it became clear that the Diocese of Salzburg deserved the pallium, for the rank of archbishop was only an institutional expression of the titles and prerogatives granted to Rupert and transferred to his successors.

When the *Conversio Bagoariorum et Carantanorum* was being written, the primacy of Salzburg among Bavarian dioceses was no longer questioned. What was still politically relevant, on the other hand, was the dispute over ecclesiastical control over the territories ruled or claimed by the Slavic House of Mojmír. The southern part of the area in question had been for decades considered to be within its sphere of interests by the Archdiocese of Salzburg. However, the problem was that in the 860s an archbishopric, usually referred to in papal sources as Archbishopric of Pannonia, was established and the Holy See entrusted this diocese to the Greek Methodius.[101] The founding of the archbishopric meant a rejection of the claims of the Bavarian Church,

---

100   JE 2495—*Salzburger Urkundenbuch*, vol. 2, no. 2c, 6.

101   There is a vast body of literature dealing with this topic. See e.g Vittorio Peri, "Il mandato missionario e canonico di Metodio e l'ingresso della lingua slava nella liturgia", *Archivum Historiae Pontificiae* 26 (1988): 9–69; Martin Eggers, *Das Erzbistum des Method. Lage,*

including Salzburg, to the control of lands that were within the sphere of Moravian domination.

We should thus interpret the work in question, bearing this conflict in mind.[102] The work was written in 870, i.e. during the synod in Regensburg which condemned St. Methodius, held in captivity by the Franks. It is, therefore, highly probable that the task which the author of the *Conversio Bagoariorum et Carantanorum* set for himself consisted in collecting arguments by means of which the see of St. Rupert could defend its rights to canonical supremacy over Pannonia. The arguments were to convince Louis the German and the synod. They may have also been addressed to the Holy See, which did not look favourably on the claims made by the Bavarian archbishopric.

The author points to legal instruments thanks to which Pannonia was canonically subordinated to Salzburg. But the argument focuses in particular on showing that both in Carantania and in the country in question Christianity was spread only by Bishops of Salzburg. St. Rupert allegedly went as far as Lower Pannonia, although the earlier versions of his *vita* gave Lorch as the easternmost city the saint had apparently reached. He was followed by a number of his successors; the historiographer writes about this in great detail.

What is particularly interesting in the context of our reflections is the line of Christianizing bishops, begun by the founder of the diocese and lasting to this day. The underlying thesis must be that the Salzburg Church is in its essence called to evangelize the pagans. This quality was revealed at the very beginning, in the person of its first bishop, St. Rupert.

However, the most important observation is one that stems from the entire dossier presented here: in the eyes of the Salzburg clerics the doctrinal claim to the pallium was based on a successful mission among the pagans. In difficult moments, when the best interests of the local community were threatened, this fact was invoked in the hope that it would take the wind out of the opponents' sails. The line of reasoning followed in Passau was similar.

4   The Example of Passau

The Passau Church was never an archbishopric. Although the local clergy on several occasions over the centuries sought to elevate the city to this high rank, every time their efforts were in vain. The first such attempt was made

---

Wirkung und Nachleben der kyrillomethodianischen Mission, Slavistische Beiträge 339 (München: O. Sagner, 1996), 17–30.

102   Wolfram, *Salzburg, Bayern, Österreich*, 192–197.

during the pontificate of Bishop Pilgrim (971–991), a member of an illustrious Bavarian family and a relation of Frederick, Archbishop of Salzburg.[103]

When Pilgrim became bishop, his diocese, like the entire south-eastern borderland area of Germany, was rising up from ruins. Until the Battle of Lechfeld in 955 it had been plagued by ruinous Hungarian invasions, and even after that date the Hungarians continued to be troublesome neighbours. This was compounded by large-scale secularizations carried out by Arnulf, Duke of Bavaria, gathering his forces to repel the Hungarian danger. The Bishopric of Passau was among those that fell victim to the confiscations. We also need to bear in mind a much more recent devastation. It was caused by warfare provoked by Henry the Quarrelsome's rebellion. In these circumstances, the most urgent matter facing the new bishop was the rebuilding of the Passau Church, above all, reconstruction of its economic foundations. But the bishop set also another, much more ambitious goal for himself.

An extraordinary letter has survived, written by Pilgrim and addressed to Pope Benedict.[104] Unfortunately, we cannot be sure whether the author meant

---

103   For information on Pilgrim, his church policy and forgeries, see e.g. Waldemar Lehr, *Pilgrim, Bischof von Passau, und die Lorcher Forschungen* (Diss. Berlin, 1909); Heinrich Fichtenau, "Urkundenfälschungen Pilgrims von Passau", 1st edition 1964, in idem, *Beiträge zur Mediävistik*, vol. 2 (Stuttgart: Thorbecke, 1977), 157–179; Heinrich Büttner, "Erzbischof Willigis von Mainz und das Papsttum bei der Bistumserrichtung in Böhmen und Mähren im 10. Jahrhundert," *Rheinische Vierteljahrsblätter* 30 (1965): 10–16; Richard Marsina, "Štúdie k slovenskému diplomatáru. I," *Historické štúdie* 16 (1971): 71–80; Egon Boshof, "Die Reorganisation des Bistums Passau nach den Ungarnstürmen," in *Das Christentum im bairischen Raum. Von den Anfängen bis ins 11. Jahrhundert*, ed. Egon Boshof and Hartmut Wolff, Passauer Historische Forschungen 8 (Cologne, Vienna and Weimar: Böhlau, 1994), 461–483; Franz-Reiner Erkens, "Die Ursprünge der Lorscher Tradition im Lichte archäologischer, historiogrqphischer und urkundlicher Zeugnisse," in ibid., 423–459; Beumann, *Theutonum nova metropolis*, 89–110. For information about Passau's metropolitan ambitions in the following centuries, see Erich Zöllner, "Die Lorcher Tradition im Wandel der Jahrhunderte," *Mitteilungen des Instituts für österreichische Geschichtsforschung* 71 (1963): 221–236 (where we will find a discussion about the source of these ambitions); Józef Szymański, "Historiograficzne analogie Passawy i Krakowa z XIII wieku", in *Polska w Europie. Studia historyczne*, ed. Henryk Zins (Lublin: Lubelski Oddział Polskiego Towarzystwa Historycznego, 1968), 99–104; Zöllner Erkens, "Die Rezeption der Lorcher Tradition im hohen Mittelalter," *Ostbairische Grenzmarken* 28 (1986): 195–206; Géza Érszegi, "Die Christianisierung Ungarns anhand der Quellen," in *Europas Mitte um 1000. Handbuch zur Ausstellung*, ed. Alfred Wieczorek and Hans-Martin Hinz, vol. 2 (Stuttgart: Theiss, 2000): 602–604. A concise analysis of Pilgrim's mentality is provided by Wolfram, *Salzburg, Bayern, Österreich*, 397.

104   Ed. Lehr, *Pilgrim*, annex, no. 6, 43–47.

Benedict VI (973–974) or Benedict VII (974–983). The letter in question, known only from 12th-century German copy books, was probably never sent. It mentions rapid progress in the Christianization of the Hungarians. As Pilgrim says, responding to requests from the Hungarian people, he sent missionaries to their country, as a result of which many local nobles were converted and Christian prisoners have achieved something that has hitherto seemed unthinkable—they can now build churches and praise the Name of God. This has led to peace between the Christians and the pagans, as if in fulfilment of Isaiah's prophecy. Things have gone so far that all Hungarians as well as four provinces of the Slavs are ready to accept the Christian faith. That is why the bishop is asking the pope to take into account the new pastoral needs and have a certain number of bishops ordained.

Pilgrim committed these words to parchment in 973–974. Shortly before that the German court had made the first attempts to Christianize the Hungarians. It is difficult to assess the effects of the mission undertaken at the time; historians' opinions about the matter differ substantially.[105] One thing is certain, though: Pilgrim was not the person who headed the evangelization; there are doubts, too, as to whether the participation of the Passau clergy in this endeavour was indeed, at least initially, considerable. To put it briefly, the facts given in the document were exaggerated at best.

The letter is full of other extraordinary elements as well. The author presents himself not as Bishop of Passau but as *Lauriacensis ecclesię servitor*. In addition, he says that during the times of the Romans and the Gepids, the countries now being evangelized had seven bishops (four of whom later remained in Moravia), who recognized the supremacy of *sanctę Lauriacensis ecclesię*—the Church which he, Pilgrim, now serves. Finally, Pilgrim asks the pope to sent him the pallium and the mitre. In justifying his request, he invokes two facts. First, the privilege of wearing the pallium was used by his predecessors in the episcopal see; second, in the present circumstances, when Christianity is spreading to new countries, he needs to be able to fulfil his pastoral duties.

As we can see, the author of the letter suggested that a church province be established, encompassing Hungary and Moravia, with himself as its head. In order to give his claims stronger foundations, he used a historical construct that had no connection with reality. It referred to an ecclesiastical province,

---

105   The results of the mission are highly regarded by, for example, Marianne Szághy, "Aspects de la christianisation des Hongrois aux IXᵉ–Xᵉ siècles", in *Early Christianity in Central and East Europe*, ed. Przemysław Urbańczyk, Congress of Commission Internationale d'Histoire Ecclésiastique Comparée, Lublin 2–6 September 1996 (Warsaw: Semper, 1997), 57–60.

allegedly existing in Roman times and encompassing Pannonia and Moesia (these geographic terms are used in the letter). The seat of this archbishopric was apparently Lauriacum, that is Lorch, a town currently situated in Upper Austria on the Enns River, near the point where it joins the Danube. In the Middle Ages Lorch was within the borders of the Diocese of Passau, so Pilgrim may have believed that he had the right to regard himself as a successor to the archbishops of the see in question.

The claims were to be substantiated by a broad collection of documents, including, in addition to the letter to Benedict, a certain number of papal bulls issued in the names of Symmachus (498–514), Eugenius II (824–827), Leo VII (936–939), Agapetus II (946–955) and Benedict VII. All of them are notorious forgeries, fabricated by Pilgrim himself at the beginning of his pontificate, that is, as is commonly assumed—in 973–974.[106] The Bavarian bishop also used imperial documents for his purposes. This was possible because at that time, when the emperor was granting a privilege to the Bishopric of Passau, Pilgrim himself dictated and was most likely the *ingrossator* of the diploma. He used the opportunity and added the title *sanctae Lauriacensis ecclesiae pontifex* or similar to his name appearing in the text.[107] He thus wanted to inveigle the monarch into recognizing the fact that he was a legal successor of Bishops of Lorch in Roman times, bishops of a see which—as he claimed—had metropolitan and archepiscopal rights.[108]

---

106   Egon Boshof wants to add one more forgery to this collection, Egon Boshof, "Das Schreiben der bayerischen Bischöfe an einen Papst Johannes—eine Fälschung Pilgrims?," in *Papstgeschichte und Landesgeschichte. Festschrift für Herrmann Jakobs zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. Joachim Dahlhaus et al., Beihefte zum Archiv für Kulturgeschichte 39 (Cologne,Weimar and Vienna: Böhlau, 1995), 37–67. According to this scholar, Pilgrim also forged a letter by the Archbishop of Salzburg Theotmar to John IX (latest edition Lošek, *Epistola Theotmari episcopi episcopi*, in *Die Conversio Bagoariorum*, 138–157). See also Egon Boshof, "Das Ostfränkische Reich und die Slawenmission im 9. Jahrhundert: die Rolle Passaus," in *Mönchtum-Kirche-Herrschaft 750–1000*, ed. Dieter R. Bauer et al. (Sigmaringen: Thorbecke, 1998), 51–76. In no way can this classification be accepted; its groundlessness has been demonstrated by: Lošek, *Die Conversio Bagoariorum*, 86–87; Dušan Třeštík, "Grossmähren, Passau und die Ungarn um das Jahr 900. Zu den Zweifeln an der Authentizität des Briefes der bayerischen Bischöfe an den Papst Johann IX. Aus dem Jahr 900," *Byzantinoslavica* 59 (1999): 137–160.

107   E.g. DO II, no. 59, 69; no. 138, 155.

108   Pilgrim also falsified royal documents, trying to strengthen the material foundations of his diocese. However, there was no direct connection between these forgeries and the plans to elevate the diocese to the rank of archbishopric.

We are thus dealing with a consistent, large-scale campaign. The rationale behind this risky venture should be sought not only in Pilgrim's personal ambitions, but also in the political and ecclesiastical context of those years. Although what we can read about the success of the Hungarian mission in the letter to Pope Benedict is an exaggeration (at best), the Bavarian bishop was well aware of the obvious fact that the Christianization of Hungary had already become part of the agenda. There is no doubt either that Pilgrim very closely followed the developments associated with the reorganization of the Church in Bohemia and Moravia.[109] Towards the end of his life Otto I took the first steps to establish a diocese in the lands that belonged to the Přemyslid state. The matter was settled during his successor's reign with the founding of Bishoprics of Prague and Moravia. The first bishops of these sees were consecrated at the turn of 975 and 976. So as Pilgrim was beginning to fabricate the afore-mentioned documents, the ecclesiastical future of Passau was being decided. The question was whether Passau would be able to play a leading role in the Christianization of Hungary and whether it would supervise the progress in the evangelization of Moravia. Its geographical location as well as missionary experiences from the previous century[110] made the see, in a way, predestined to such a task. However, in order to become the head of the mission, the Passau hierarch had to be an archbishop. Thus, as we can see, it was not only about the pallium and mitre for Pilgrim.

There is no doubt that Pilgrim's plans must have come up against some serious obstacles. First, the emperor and the pope had to be won over to the idea, which in itself was not an easy task. However, above all, the resistance of the Archbishop of Salzburg had to be overcome; were Pilgrim's plan to be implemented, the Salzburg metropolitan would become the most aggrieved party. Not only would the door to Hungary be shut to him, but he would also lose supremacy over the Bishop of Passau, his suffragan bishop. Quite unexpectedly there emerged another rival, namely the Archbishop of Mainz.

---

109 Büttner, "Erzbischof Willigis," 1–16; Peter Hilsch, "Der Bischof von Prag und das Reich in sächsischer Zeit," *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters* 28 (1972): 6–16; Egon Boshof, "Mainz, Böhmen und das Reich im Früh- und Hochmittelalter," *Archiv für mittelrheinische Kirchengeschichte* 50 (1998) 20–25; Zdenka Hledíková, "Prag zwischen Mainz und Rom. Beziehungen des Bistums zu seiner Metropole und zum Papsttum," ibid., 71–88.

110 Boshof, "Das Ostfränkische Reich," passim, questions the traditional belief that in the 9th century Passau played an important role in the Christianization of Moravia. This is an erroneous view, which has been demonstrated by Třeštík, "Grossmähren," especially 142–147.

The establishment of a metropolitan see in Passau would mean an end to the plans to extend Mainz's supremacy to Bohemia and Moravia.

Despite these difficulties it might have seemed that the plans were quite realistic. Christianity was winning new ground in territories belonging to Germany's eastern and northern neighbours, and the Church's organization was developing and getting stronger. New bishoprics were founded in Polabia and Denmark, and an archbishopric was established in Magdeburg near the Slavic border. All this was happening with significant contributions being made by the Empire and the German Church. In such circumstances it seemed obvious that the expansion of the ecclesiastical organization in the Přemyslid state and the Christianization of Hungary would happen soon, that these ventures would need the help of a frontier bishopric, such as Passau, and that there would undoubtedly emerge a need to establish a new church province. Salzburg certainly would not want to agree to that, but, after all, the attempt to erect an archbishopric in Magdeburg was opposed by the mighty Mainz as well and this opposition was eventually overcome. There were missionary considerations in favour of the foundation of a metropolitan see in Magdeburg and missionary considerations could also weigh in Passau's favour.

The series of forgeries made by Pilgrim was to provide evidence that his diocese had been and still was an archbishopric and a metropolitan see.[111] The readers learn, for example, that former popes referred to the hierarchs occupying the see of Lorch as archbishops, that they granted them the right to wear the pallium and that they approved their authority over bishops who provided pastoral care for peoples living in territories called by the forger Pannonia and Moesia or, using more modern names, Avaria and Moravia. This was the case in Roman times, in Carolingian times and a quarter of a century earlier. This legal status is confirmed in Benedict VI's bull, issued allegedly during the reign of Otto II, that is, literally contemporaneously: the bull allegedly made Pilgrim archbishop, granted him the pallium and elevated him to the rank of papal vicar.[112] The matter of the vicariate also appears earlier, in Eugenius II's document, where the significance of this title is discussed in greater detail.[113] Worthy of note is the fact that Pilgrim cared not only about the title of metropolitan

---

111   All of them are published in Lehr, *Pilgrim*, annex, nos. 1–5, 7, 30–43, 48–51. With the exception of number 1, the bulls have newer editions to which I will refer later as necessary.

112   Lehr, *Pilgrim*, annex, no. 7, especially 51; see *Papsturkunden 896–1046*, vol. 1 no. †223, 439–440.

113   Lehr, *Pilgrim*, annex, no. 2, 32–33. See a more recent edition of *Codex diplomaticus et epistolaris Slovaciae*, vol. 1, ed. Richard Marsina (Bratislava: Slovenská akadémia vied, 1971), no. 4, 6.

but also about the office of papal vicar. This does not mean, however, that the Bishop of Passau intended to extend his authority to include other church provinces. It was more about strengthening his powers in missionary territories within the planned province.[114]

These are all facts directly demonstrating the prerogatives of the head of the Passau see, provided, of course, that these facts are considered to be true. In addition, the forgeries contain some historical material, which ideologically legitimizes, in a way, the status of the local Church as an archbishopric and church province.

How did Pilgrim imagine its history? The city (*urbs*) of Lorch accepted the Christian religion at the very beginning of the universal Church and learned the basics of the doctrine from teachers sent directly from Rome. This was a time of terrible persecutions of Christians. The city in question became a place from which the grace of faith spread across the whole of Upper and Lower Pannonia through various preachers. Both provinces and their bishops were subordinated to the Archbishop of Lorch. Following invasions by the Huns and the havoc wreaked by them, the Lorch metropolitan was forced to move his see elsewhere, as a result of which he lost his title. As the office of Apostolic vicar was vacant in Bavaria, Arno of Salzburg was made archbishop. Later, however, when peace was finally established, the Bishop of Lorch, in the person of Gerhard, again became metropolitan. This is what we can find out about the subject from Pope Agapetus II's bull.[115]

From Eugenius II's bull we learn that the Lorch province was revived many years before Gerhard's pontificate. This happened during the tenure of Archbishop Urolf, on whom the pope bestowed the pallium and the office of Apostolic vicar. Pilgrim associates this revival with missionary activity. Urolf—explains the author of the forgery—brought the people of Avaria and Moravia to God as his adopted sons.[116]

As we follow the history of Lorch, as it is presented by the Bishop of Passau, we are struck by four facts which must have been of ideological significance to the author. First, it is about linking the origins of the local Church to the beginnings of Christianity and to Rome. We know very well—as I have mentioned earlier—that in medieval disputes over the superiority of this or other bishopric, roots going back as far as Antiquity as well as Apostolicity were

---

114   Beumann, *Theutonum nova metropolis*, 105.

115   Lehr, *Pilgrim*, annex, no. 5, 41; the latest edition of *Papsturkunden 896–1046*, vol. 1, no. †116, 204–205.

116   Lehr, *Pilgrim*, annex, no. 2, 31–34; *Codex diplomaticus et epistolaris Slovaciae*, vol. 1, no. 4, 5–6.

sometimes crucial. Although the claim to Apostolic origins of the Archbish-
opric of Lorch is not presented *expressis verbis* in the forged documents, care-
ful and well-disposed readers will easily become convinced that this is indeed
true. It was in this spirit that the Passau forgeries were interpreted by histori-
ography developing in the 13th century in Kremsmünster.[117]

However, there is no doubt that Pilgrim's conviction was firmer when he
used another argument. The texts in question speak very emphatically of
the contribution made in the past and the present by the Church in Lorch
to the evangelization of the pagans. We can easily conclude from this that
the Bishop of Lorch deserves the pallium, because his see is an inexhaust-
ible source of Christianity for all neighbouring countries and nations. Lorch
Christianized them several times over the centuries: at the beginning of the
Church, during the Carolingian era and in the present. Whenever the docu-
ments mention these successes, they always raise the issue of the rank of arch-
bishopric for *Lauriacum*. In the first case a cause-and-effect link is indicated
by the context: one sentence mentions the evangelization of Pannonia and
from the following one we learn of metropolitan rights exercised from the very
beginning by bishops of Lorch. In the second case the forgery states clearly and
unequivocally: the pope grants the pallium to Urolf, because, among others,
the bishop has converted Avaria and Moravia. This—as the forger stresses—is
what justice demands. But the arguments are even denser. Urolf is the father
of new Christians, because he has begotten them for God, ruling them thanks
to the help of heaven.[118] We could say that ecclesiastical supremacy stems from
the very fact of evangelization, if the evangelizer becomes a spiritual father of
new children of God and if behind this fact is the will of higher powers.

In the letter to Pope Benedict—and this is the third way of presenting the
argument—the matter is presented as follows. Pilgrim has converted great
multitudes of Hungarians and Slavs, so he should receive the pallium in order
to take the neophytes under his care. The author of the letter assumes—and
this is what he expects from the Holy See—that bishops will be appointed for
the peoples in question, bishops over whom he will have authority.[119] Pilgrim's
metropolitan power stems from the logic of the situation: if the bishop provides

---

117   *Historia episcoporum Pataviensium et ducum Bavariae*, ed. Georg Waitz, MGH SS, vol. 25
        (Hanover: Hahn, 1880), 617. For information about this historiography, see Karl Schnith,
        "Bayerische Geschichtsschreibung im Spätmittelalter. Eine Studie zu den Quellen von
        Passau-Kremsmünster," *Historisches Jahrbuch* 97/98 (1978): 194–212.

118   Lehr, *Pilgrim*, annex, no. 2, 32; *Codex diplomaticus et epistolaris Slovaciae*, 6.

119   Lehr, *Pilgrim*, annex, no. 6, 43–45.

pastoral care for the Hungarians and the Slavs, this fact should be sanctioned by law.

Finally, we should note that among the ideological instruments with which Pilgrim armed himself some role was played by the martyrdom of the Church in Lorch. This motive appears in several places. Agapetus II's bull says that the Lorch Church emerged during a period of great persecution of Christians. The readers had the right to conclude that this persecution had also affected Lorch. Benedict VI's document mentions a number of martyrs, who died for their faith in the ecclesiastical province in question.[120]

However, the most food for thought is provided by Symmachus' bull. According to it, Archbishop Theodore received the privilege of wearing the pallium. The fragment concerning this fact, filling the entire context of the document, reads as follows:

> Diebus vitę tuę pallii usum, quem ad sacerdotali officii decorem et ad ostendendam unanimitatem, quam cum beato Petro apostolo universus grex dominicarum ovium, quę ei commissę sunt, habere non dubium est, ab apostolica sede, sicut decuit, poposcisti, quod utpote ab eisdem apostolicis fundatę ecclesię maiorum more libenter indulsimus ad ostendendum te magistrum et archiepiscopum tuamque sanctam Lauriacensem ecclesiam provincię Pannoniorum sedem fore metropolitanam. *Idcirco pallio, quod apostolica caritate tibi destinamus, quo uti debeas secundum morem ęcclesię tuę, sollerter ammonemus pariterque volumus, ut intelligas, quia ipse vestitus, quo ad missarum sollemnia ornaris, signum pretendit crucis, per quod scito te et fratribus debere compati ac mundialibus enlecebris in affectu crucifigi.* Unde ergo cum deforis huiusmodi insignio indueris, intus in animo considera, quod hoc sit magis oneris quam honoris atque cor tuum deo regente ab appetitu istius seculi sic tempera, ut et commissam exsequi gubernationem studeas et adeptę dignitati, cuius sublimaris officio, et probitate morum et vivacitate sollicitudinis ac custodia intergerrimę fidei congruas, quatenus tu ipse a remuneratore omnium bonorum deo et benedictionis gratiam vitamque aeternam consequi merearis.[121]

---

120   Lehr, *Pilgrim*, annex, no. 7, especially 49; see *Papsturkunden 896–1046*, vol. 1, no. †223, 438.

121   Lehr, *Pilgrim*, annex, no. 1, 30–31, italics mine. ("In your days you requested the use of the pallium, as is fitting, from the apostolic see—the pallium which, there is no doubt, is to be considered the ornament of the priestly office and is used to show the unanimity of the whole herd of the Lord's sheep, who are given over to Saint Peter the apostle, with him. This request we gladly grant to your church, founded by the same apostolic command,

Leaving aside the analysis of the entire text, I shall focus on the fragment in italics. In the early Middle Ages it was for normal for the Bishop of Rome, when granting the pallium, to give some kind of moral or religious justification. *Liber diurnus* provides several examples of the relevant formula.[122] However, none of them resembles the fragment from Symmachus' document, either in literary terms or from the point of view of the content. When fabricating the document, Pilgrim modelled it on Eugenius II's bull for the Archbishop of Salzburg, Adalramm (JE 2558), which also mentions the conferment of the pallium.[123]

---

in the manner of our elders, to show that you are the master and archbishop, and your church of Lorsch shall be the metropolitan seat of the province of Pannonia. *We have sent you the pallium in apostolic love, and you should use it according to the customs of your church. We wish therefore in all concern to admonish you and equally we wish that you understand that when you are dressed in the pallium, with which you adorn the ceremony of the mass, it gives the sign of the cross, through which you should know that you and your brothers ought to suffer with Christ and by crucified in spirit for worldly enticements.* For this reason therefore, when you are dressed in such a sign outside, you should think within your mind whether this is more a burden or an honour, and with God guiding, restrain your heart from the appetites of this world in such a manner that you are zealous in fulfilling the governance granted to you, and are suited to the nobility you have striven for to which you are sublimated by the office; and equally that you are suited to the probity of customs, the lively solicitude, and the custody of the integral faith, so that you yourself may deserve to pursue the grace of the blessing of God, the remunerator of all good things, as well as eternal life.")

122   *Liber diurnus Romanorum Pontificum*, ed. Theodor Sickel (Vienna Apud C. Geroldi Filium Bibliopolam, 1889), nos. 45–48, 32–40.

123   "Pallii usum quem ad sacerdotalis officii decorem et ad ostendendam unanimitatem quam cum beato Petro apostolo universus grex dominicarum ovium, quę ei commissę sunt, habere non dubium est, ab apostolica sede sicut decuit poposcisti, utpote ab eisdem apostolis fundatę ecclesię more libenter indulsimus et ad ostendendam (in) te tuamque ecclesiam eiusdem sanctae Iuvavensis ęcclesiam proviniciae Baiouvariorum sedis apostolicae caritatem ex nostro etiam tibi usu pallii quod secundum tuae morem uti possis ecclesiae, destinasse signamus, illum tuam fraternitatem congrue ac necessario commonentes, ut et credite tibi ecclesiae opus et apostolicę (in te) sedis benivolentiam affectum considerans, ita deo regente cor tuum commissam exsequi gubernationem studeas et adepta cuius ornaris officii dignitate, et probitate morum et vivacitatis sollicitudine et custodia integritatem fidei ipse etiam adornare contendens amplius studeas adornari et benedictionis gratiam vitamque aeternam a misericordissimo domino deo nostro consequi merearis"—*Salzburger Urkundenbuch*, vol. 2, no. 7b, 19–20. See Lehr, *Pilgrim*, 20 ("You requested the use of the pallium, as was fitting, from the apostolic see—the pallium which, there is no doubt, is to be considered the ornament of the priestly office and is used to show the unanimity of the whole herd of the Lord's sheep, who are given over to Saint Peter the apostle, with him. This request we gladly grant to your church, founded

To some, though small, extent the Bishop of Passau was inspired by a similar document issued by Gregory IV for the Metropolitan of Salzburg, Liupramm (JE 2580)[124] or Nicholas I's document for Adalwin (JE 2681), containing an identical text.[125] Pilgrim took much from Eugenius II's bull, but neither in this document nor in Gregory's (or Nicholas's) bull did he find the fragment in question. It seems thus that he himself came up with this justification. It must have been very important for him, given the fact that the bulls which he came across and from which he took longer or shorter fragments contain long and flowery passages about the ethical meaning of the pallium as well as moral obligations for archbishops stemming from it. Clearly, he must have concluded that he had not found what he cared most about in these model documents.

The specificity of Symmachus' bull lies in the fact that it contains a reference to martyrdom. The pallium—claims the forger—is a sign of the cross, an admonition for an archbishop to be a co-sufferer of his brothers and to renounce worldly pleasures. By introducing such an extraordinary content into the document, Pilgrim may have referred to the diocese's past marked by martyrdom. We do not know whether in his view Theodore was a martyr. In any case, 13th-century tradition did not associate this mythical archbishop with death for faith. It seems that there was not much more information about him than was provided by Symmachus' alleged document.[126] Of course, we cannot ascertain what information Pilgrim had about his predecessor and how

———————

by the same apostles, and we mark you to have been appointed by us to show the love of the apostolic see in yourself and your church, the church of holy Salzburg of the province of Bavarians, by use of the pallium, which you may use according to the custom of your church. We do so admonishing your brotherliness, suitably and necessarily, that you should believe that the aid of the church towards you and considering the benevolence of the apostolic see as it has taken effect in you, and thus with God guiding you should be zealous to make your heart fulfil the governance granted to you, and also be zealous to be fitting for the dignity of the office you adorn. Furthermore, striving to adorn the integrity of the faith by the probity of your customs, and solicitude and care for liveliness, you should yourself be zealous to be adorned and deserve, from the most merciful God our Lord, to pursue the grace of benediction and eternal life").

124 *Salzburger Urkundenbuch*, vol. 2, no. 13, 27–29; cf. especially: "Ecce frater karissime inter multa alia ista sunt sacerdotii, ista sunt pallii, quę si studiose servavaveris, quod foris accepisse ostenderis, intus habebis" (ibid., 28).—"Behold beloved brother, among many other things these are the priestly offices, these the vestment, which, if you have zealously preserved them, what you show yourself to have received externally, you will have within yourself."

125 Ibid., no. 19, 35–36.

126 See *Historia episcoporum Pataviensium*, 619 (interpolation of manuscript B) and 620 under the year 620.

he wanted to amplify it. But even if Theodore himself was not a martyr, among people living in his diocese in various periods there were many who died for Christ and that was enough for the Church in Lorch to be regarded as a Church of martyrs.

We need to be aware of the fact that the Bishop of Passau constructed history in this manner to justify the following thesis: the Lorch Church deserves to be an archbishopric. There was a traditional belief, in some sense certainly true, that its past had been marked by martyrdom. Pilgrim decided to use this glorious chapter from its history as an argument supporting the above mentioned thesis. By introducing into Symmachus' bull a passage in which the pallium was presented as a symbol of the cross, he created a necessary premise for conclusions. Drawing on this premise, he could claim or, rather, carefully suggest that if Lorch was a Church of martyrs, it deserved to be made an ecclesiastical province. It was relatively unimportant whether Theodore himself or people of his diocese had died for their faith. What was important was the fact—as the forger suggests—that this mythical archbishop was in some sense a martyr, if only because by living a pious life, he identified himself with "true" martyrs.

It is debatable whether and to what extent Pilgrim drew in his vision on authentic elements from the past, such as real facts from the history of the ancient Church in the Danube River basin. On the one hand, we know for sure that in Roman times Lauriacum was the seat of a bishopric. On the other, Pilgrim amplified real facts he knew—we know that, too, beyond any doubt. There is another question: did he make these amplifications in good faith or to what extent did he simply lie?[127] From our point of view, the issue is not really important. Even if the forger did use some elements of reality, they were just pieces out of which a certain whole still needed to be constructed. What is important for us are the rules according to which this construct was made, because they reveal to us the views on the conditions a local Church had to meet to be considered worthy of being made an archbishopric.

I have been able to distinguish four motives used by Pilgrim to raise the prestige of his diocese: its Apostolic origins, successful evangelization, pastoral

---

127   Cf. opposing views of two scholars: Ignaz Zibermayr, *Noricum, Bayern und Österreich. Lorch als Hauptstadt und die Einführung des Christentums*, 1st ed. 1944 (Horn N. Ö.: Berger, 1956), passim; Erkens, "Die Ursprünge der Lorcher Tradition," passim. Erkens is inclined to agree that Pilgrim created his concept almost completely *ex nihilo* and this view seems convincing. A useful bibliography of this discussion is provided by Erkens, "Die Ursprünge der Lorcher Tradition," fn. 19, 203–204.

needs and martyrdom. They were not legal requirements as such, but they did support Passau's claims from the ideological and moral side. In their light people could become convinced that Passau should become a metropolitan see not only because it had once enjoyed this title, but simply because it deserved it.

The campaign started by Pilgrim failed and Passau did not become a metropolitan see. We do not even know whether and to what extent the bishop showed the papal bulls forged by himself to the outsiders. On the other hand, there is no doubt that he must have taken some steps, if Frederick of Salzburg was clearly worried. Defending the possessions of his Church, he fabricated a bull by Benedict VI confirming the privilege of papal vicariate in Noricum as well as in Upper and Lower Pannonia for the archbishops of that city, as well as their exclusive right to wear the pallium and ordain bishops in these provinces.[128] The message of the forged document is very clear: it was to counter the bull by the same Benedict forged by Pilgrim.[129]

The imperial chancellery must have noticed at some point that it was being manipulated. Suffice it to say that in 977 it refused to authenticate a fair copy of a document drafted by the Bishop of Passau. The document concerned Otto II's donation to a church in Lorch, but it also contained deliberately ambiguous terms concerning the legal status of that church in ancient times. Moreover, the author took the liberty of including a clause whereby Lauriacum, following the emperor's decision, again became a Mother Church and an episcopal see and Pilgrim himself ascended the throne of the Bishop of Lorch "quatinus amodo tam ipse quam omnes sui successores Lauriacenses fiant et nominentur pontifices".[130] The copy that was eventually authenticated omitted this clause.[131] People at the imperial court must have realized that the Bishop of Passau was playing some suspicious game.[132]

The dossier prepared by Pilgrim proved useless. However, thanks to the forger's ambitions and foresight, modern scholars can gain an insight into the early medieval world of ideas concerning the conditions a bishopric should meet to receive the *pallium*.

---

128   *Papsturkunden*, vol. 1, no. 224, 440–442. See Beumann, *Theutonum nova metropolis*, 89–110.

129   See fn. 109.

130   DO II, no. 167ª, 189–191, the fragment in question on 191.

131   DO II, no. 167ᵇ, 189–191.

132   See e.g. Boshof, "Die Reorganisation des Bistums Passau", 471–472.

5   The Example of Benevento

The paradigms discussed so far do not exhaust the question. To present a complete picture, I need to examine one more example.

In the 960s three ecclesiastical provinces were established with Otto I's contribution: Magdeburg, Capua and Benevento. Soon after that, during the reign of Otto II, Salerno was made an archbishopric. For reasons that will become clear in a moment, I shall focus on Benevento.

The elevation of the three south Italian dioceses to the rank of archbishopric took place in similar or even identical geo-ecclesiastical and geopolitical circumstances. In late Antiquity Benevento, Capua and Salerno belonged to the Roman ecclesiastical province—with the pope serving as its metropolitan— and this remained the state of affairs until the Ottonian period.[133] In the 10th century they were all capitals of statelets which in the early 9th century had been part of one territorial unit—the Lombard Duchy of Benevento.[134] Having become autonomous, throughout the 9th and 10th centuries the statelets resisted the expansion of the Byzantine Empire, the presence of which in southern Italy was a constant feature. On the other hand, they also had to face the Western Empire. Its pressure was very strongly felt until as late as the third quarter of the 9th century and then again when Otto I was crowned emperor in Rome. The rulers of the south Lombard statelets tried to manoeuvre between the two superpowers. In Ottonian times they were more willing to accept the hegemony of the Germans than that of the Byzantines and sought support against the Greeks among them. At the same time they used the power of the rulers from beyond the Alps to create huge territorial blocs. The Liudolfingians were usually well disposed towards such plans, because in this way they gained a valuable ally in their conflict with the Eastern Empire.

The Germans were particularly active with regard to the south Lombard statelets in the second half of the 960s and in the early 970s. At Christmas 966, the Prince of Capua, Pandulf the Ironhead (943–981), went to Rome and swore

---

133   Ottorino Bertolini, "Le chiese longobarde dopo la conversione al cattolicesimo ed i loro rapporti con il papato", in *Le chiese nei regni dell'Europa occidentale e i loro rapporti sino all'800*, vol. 1, Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo 7/1 (Spoleto: Presso la Sede del Centro, 1960), 457.

134   A concise but informative guide to the political history of southern Italy in the 9th– 10th centuries is given by Horst Enzensberger in *Handbuch der europäischen Geschichte*, ed. Theodor Schieder, vol. 1 (Stuttgart: Union Verlag, 1976), 793–799. Many facts and analyses can be found in a great treatise by Huguette Taviani-Carozzi, *La prinicipauté lombarde de Salerne (IXe–XIe siècle). Pouvoir et société en Italie lombarde méridionale*, vols. 1–2, Collection de l'Ecole Française de Rome 152 (Rome: Ecole française, 1991).

allegiance to Otto I, in exchange for which he received Spoleto and Camerino from the emperor. At the beginning of the following year the emperor travelled to Benevento, where he received the homage of Landulf III (961–969), Pandulf's brother. When Landulf III died, the German ruler allowed his vassal Pandulf to put his son, Landulf IV, on the throne. Otto I also established friendly relations with Gisulf, Prince of Salerno. In 973 that principality, too, found itself in Pandulf's hands. Thus emerged a strong territorial bloc, defending the Liudolfingians' position against the Byzantines. On the other hand, it was not strong enough to help them conquer the Byzantine Apulia and Calabria, a conquest which Otto I and his son sought in vain.

Political rivalry between the two empires in Italy was accompanied by religious rivalry. The Byzantine emperors, in accordance with a long tradition, sought to gain control over southern Italy by means of ecclesiastical instruments. Firstly, they tried to subordinate the local dioceses to the ecclesiastical provinces they established. Secondly, they imposed obedience to Constantinople on the south Italian Church.[135]

Acting in accordance with these principles, in 968 Nikephoros II Phokas elevated the autocephalous Archbishopric of Otranto to the rank of a province and the Patriarch of Constantinople assigned to it five suffragan bishoprics situated on the border of Lucania and Apulia. This move was met with a counteraction from Rome. In 969 Pope John XIII decided to make Benevento an archbishopric. Interestingly, the dioceses subordinated to that province did not exist yet and were to be founded by the new metropolitan.[136] The pope's decision must have been dictated more by political considerations than the administrative needs of the Church.

Should the promotion of Capua, elevated by John XIII to the rank of archbishopric, also be interpreted as a response to Nikephoros II Phokas's move? It is highly plausible, though not entirely certain. We do not know the exact date of the foundation of the ecclesiastical province of Capua; it may have happened slightly earlier, in 966–967.[137] An archbishopric with its see in Salerno

---

135   A general analysis of the ecclesiastical situation on the Greek-Latin frontier in Italy is carried out by Vera von Falkenhausen, *Untersuchungen über die byzantinische Herrschaft in Süditalien vom 9. bis ins 11 Jahrhundert*, Schriften zur Geistesgeschichte des Östlichen Europa 1 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1967), 148–157.

136   Hans-Walter Klewitz, "Zur Geschichte der Bistumsorganisation Campaniens und Apuliens im 10. und 11. Jahrhundert," *Quellen und Forschungen von Italienischen Archiven und Bibliotheken* 24 (1932/33): 4–16.

137   The problem is examined by Taviani-Carozzi, *La principauté lombarde*, vol. 1, 671–672. She herself is in favour of the date 968, interpreting the founding of the Archbishopric of Capua as a response to the founding of the Otranto province.

was established most likely in 983[138] and this should be analyzed in the context of Pope Benedict VII's church policy as well as imperial plans of Otto II, who, even more energetically than his father, tried to chase the Byzantines out of southern Italy, though the results of his efforts were pitiful. The significance of the papal decision becomes obvious, if we take into account the fact that most dioceses subordinated to the new metropolitan see were situated outside the Principality of Salerno and outside the sphere of influence of the Roman Church.[139]

We need to take a closer look at the circumstances in which the Archbishopric of Benevento was established. Let us refer to the preamble from John XIII's bull addressed to Landulf, Archbishop of Benevento, and dated 26 May 969:

> Cum certum sit Dei servientibus eterni premia reservari, nobis tamen necesse est honorum beneficia eis tribuere, ut in Dei laudibus ex remuneratione valeant multiplicius insudare. Et quia Beneventanensis ecclesia in exercentibus Dei laudibus magno conatu piaque religione semper insistit atque erga reverentiam sancte et apostolice Romane ecclesie precipue exuberasse cognovimus, quod nobis olim apud eam manentibus omnino constat inventum, debemus itaque ex ardore caritatis atque studio divini cultus eam causam honoris ac reverentie sublimiorem inter ceteras ordinare. Et quoniam sancta sedes est, ubi beati Bartholomei apostoli corpus requiescit, merito decet augmento culminis amplius decorari, quoniam et ad hoc divine miserationis respectu curam regiminis suscepimus, ut ad exhibenda Deo sedula servitia et canoras laudes potentie sue cunctos debemus sollicite invitare.[140]

---

138   Ibid., 672–673.

139   Ibid., vol. 2, 998.

140   Papsturkunden, vol. 1, no. 197, 389–392, quote from 390 ("Although it is certain that eternal rewards are reserved for the servants of God, we must nevertheless bestow upon them the reward of honours so that they are able to labour even more in praise of God for the sake of remuneration. Moreover, since we recognise that the Beneventan church has always devoted itself with great efforts and pious devotion to strenuous praise of God and has been especially exuberant in its reverence towards the holy and apostolic Roman church—as we always find whenever in that ecclesiastical province—we should therefore from the fire of love and in the zeal of divine worship ordain that church to be higher than others on account of its honour and reverence. And since it is the holy see where the body of Saint Bartholomew the Apostle rests, it is fitting to adorn it by augmenting its heights, as we have received the charge of governance to do so in respect of divine mercy, and also since we must take care to urge all to show sweet service to God and melodious praise of his power").

The narrative and the instructions following these words tell us that on 26 May a synod was held at the Confession of St. Peter, featuring, in addition to John XIII, Emperor Otto I as well as a number of church and state dignitaries; that the pope, presiding over the synod, granted Landulf the privilege of wearing the pallium, the power of archbishop and the right to ordain bishops from the sees listed by name; and that the pope was acting encouraged by the emperor and acceding to a request from Pandulf, Duke of Benevento and Capua, and Margrave of Spoleto and Camerino.

I have previously emphasized the significance of the political context to the founding of the Archbishopric of Benevento; the role of Otto I and Pandulf, highlighted in the document, strengthens this impression even more. But the preamble says nothing about this. The arguments given in it are of a completely different nature. The Benevento Church deserves the promotion for two reasons: firstly—and above all—because it venerates God with great piety, secondly—owing to the respect of this Church for the Holy See. But John XIII invokes another reason as well: the body of St. Bartholomew is buried in the see of the bishopric in question.[141]

We know from other sources that the mortal remains of the Apostle were brought to Benevento in 838 by Prince Sicard and Bishop Ursus. The following year the latter placed the relics in a special shrine built next to the Cathedral of the Virgin Mary and connected with it.[142] The translation was an element of a broader enterprise. Sicard's predecessor, Prince Sico, acquired the body of St. Januarius and placed it in a chapel which he founded inside the cathedral. Some sources, the reliability of which is not entirely certain, suggest that the relics of many other saints were acquired in a variety of ways and brought to Benevento in the same period. We can see in this a continuation of the work of Arechis II,[143] the difference being that this great ruler placed the relics in the palace chapel of Divine Wisdom, and now the newly acquired remains were collected in the cathedral or around it. It was probably an attempt to strengthen the authority of the bishopric. We can see this intention in the selection of the

---

141   Zob. Ernst Haiger, "Königtum und Kirchenorganisation: Erzbistumgründungen im Hochmittelalter," *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 112 (2001): 315, 321.

142   For information about the translation of St. Bartholomew and other Benevento translations in the 9th century, see. Hans Belting, "Studien zum beneventanischen Hof im 8. Jahrhundert," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 16 (1962): 160–162 Antonio Vuolo, "Agiografia beneventana," in *Longobardia e longobardi nell'Italia meridionale. Atti del 2 Convegno internazionale di studi promosso dal Centro di Cultura dell'Universita Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, Benevento, 29–31 maggio 1992*, ed. Giancarlo Andenna and Giorgio Picasso (Milan: Vita e Pensiero, 1996), 220–226.

143   I shall write about it in Chapter II.3.

saints: Januarius was a greatly venerated bishop, while Bartholomew was an Apostle. On the other hand, the Dukes of Benevento did not distance themselves from this venture. On the contrary, they were in charge of it, hoping that the new patrons would obtain favours for them. An eyewitness to the translation of St. Januarius provides us with a significant detail: Prince Sico placed his crown on the altar of St. Januarius.[144]

Various facts demonstrate that towards the end of the 8th century and in the first decades of the 9th, the Bishopric of Benevento acquired a sense of its dignity and at the same time became convinced that it had a big role to play.[145] Collecting relics was an expression of these ambitions; in addition, it was to be a means of fulfilling them. John XIII's bull is evidence of this fact. What strikes us in it is a conviction that if the cathedral in Benevento hides the body of the Apostle in its womb, the see deserves to become an archbishopric and that this higher rank is necessary to worship God in an appropriate manner.

As we can see, there were serious political considerations supporting the establishment of an archbishopric in Benevento: the foundation would satisfy all interested state entities, with the exception of the Byzantine Empire, and would not undermine the position of any Latin ecclesiastical institution—the dioceses subordinated to the new province could not rebel, for they did not yet really exist. Yet people still felt the need to invoke the presence of the relics of a great saint. In this case it was an exceptional saint, namely one of the Apostles.

6   Summing Up

The hierarchization of local Churches in the early Latin Middle Ages was manifested in two forms, as it were. On the one hand, the criterion was the rank as defined by canon law. This meant primarily bishopric, archbishopric and papacy, but also primacy and papal vicariate. Another hierarchization was based on less formal factors: location of the see of a diocese in an ancient city, ideally in a distinguished centre of pagan cult; establishment of the diocese at the very beginning of the Universal Church; its founding by an Apostle or a disciple of an Apostle; the presence in the cathedral or other metropolitan

---

144   *Translatio ss. Januarii Festi et Desiderii*, in *Acta Sanctorum*, Septembris vol. 6, Paris and Rome, 1867, cap. 9, 890; see Vuolo, "Agiografia beneventana," 224.

145   Bernhard Schimmelpfennig, "Ein Bischof dem Papste gleich? Zu den Insignien und Vorrechten des Erzbischofs von Benevent," in *Aus Archiven und Bibliotheken. Festschrift Raymund Kottje*, ed. Hubert Mordek, Freiburger Beiträge zur mittelalterlichen Geschichte 3 (Franfurt and Berlin: Lang, 1992), 407–408; Vuolo, "Agiografia beneventana," 223–224.

church of the relics of outstanding saints. The examples discussed above also teach us that considerable weight was attached to missionary work among the pagans carried out at the beginning of the bishopric as well as in later periods.

Both types of hierarchy overlapped to some extent, but not always and not completely. Not every bishopric founded by an Apostolic disciple was a metropolitan see, and the rivalry among provinces, invoking, for example, the significance the respective cities had had in Antiquity, did not always lead to a differentiation of their legal status. Nevertheless, it must be said that these informal factors were used to defend the existing legal status and to achieve it. We must also stress that more than mere prestige was at stake. These factors placed a local Church within the order of sanctity, which is why—we can even say primarily—they filled its faithful with hope for worldly and eternal prosperity.

The Founding of the Archbishopric of Gniezno: Religious Premises and Political Consequences

1 Introductory Remarks

Very little can be said about the beginnings of the church organization in Poland.[1] We know that Bishop Jordan began his work in Mieszko I's state in 968 at the latest and that he was succeeded by Bishop Unger. It seems beyond doubt as well that shortly before the breakthrough of 999–1000 Unger headed a regular diocese with a specific see and at least approximately marked borders.[2] On the other hand, we cannot be certain as to where this see was located: in Gniezno[3] or in Poznań.

I am more inclined to agree with the traditional view, shared by most scholars, that the oldest Polish bishopric had its see in Poznań. Two arguments are especially important, in my opinion. Firstly, German accounts from the early 11th century list Poznań as the episcopal see of a diocese which existed in Poland before the breakthrough years of 999–1000. Yet I have to agree that the authors of these sources, well-informed as they were, do not inspire confidence. They

---

1 For information about the church organization in Poland, see first of all works by Gerard Labuda, summing up and developing earlier research; e.g. *Studia nad początkami państwa polskiego*, vol. 2, Uniwersytet Adama Mickiewicza, Historia 140 (Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu im. Adama Mickiewicza, 1988), especially 426–484; more recently idem, *Mieszko I* (Wrocław, Warsaw and Kraków: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 2002), 107–116; see also Jerzy Strzelczyk, *Mieszko Pierwszy* (Poznań: Abos, 1992), 129–145; Stanisław Trawkowski, "Początki Kościoła w Polsce za panowania Mieszka I," in *Polska Mieszka I*, ed. Jan M. Piskorski (Poznań: Ośrodek Wydawnictw Naukowych, 1993), 51–72.

2 Research results which I find generally convincing include results of studies carried out in Poznań: Józef Nowacki, *Kościół katedralny w Poznaniu. Studium historyczne*, idem, *Dzieje archidiecezji poznańskiej*, vol. 1 ([Poznań]: Księgarnia Św. Wojciecha, 1959), 11–43; Marian Banaszak, "Charakter prawny biskupów Jordana i Ungera," *Nasza Przeszłość* 30 (1969): 43–123. To this group I should now add an important study by Weiss, who examines the issue against a broad background (Weiss, *Biskupstwa bezpośrednio zależne*, for information about Poznań, see 255–259).

3 This view was for many years consistently advocated by Gerard Labuda, "O najstarszej organizacji Kościoła w Polsce," *Przegląd Powszechny* (1984), no. 6/754: 373–396 and publications listed in fn. 1; also Trawkowski, "Początki Kościoła," 65.

were too biased when assessing Polish affairs and were too personally involved in church policy. However, this charge can be counterbalanced by the following observation: no text mentions Gniezno as an episcopal see before 999. The second argument runs as follows. When describing the events associated with Otto III's pilgrimage to St. Adalbert's tomb, Thietmar states that Unger did not consent to the founding of an archbishopric in Gniezno and suggests at the same time what the legal grounds for the protest were: the Archbishopric of Gniezno was established within the territory of Unger's diocese.[4] If Unger had been the Bishop of Gniezno, he would have protested mainly because of having been forcibly removed from his see. This would indeed have been an unheard of event and the Magdeburg circles, to which Thietmar himself belonged in a way, hostile to the Polish church province, would not have failed to point out such iniquity.

As Mieszko I was being baptized, the lands on the Warta and Middle Vistula rivers were a virgin pagan territory. Never before—neither in Antiquity nor in the early Middle Ages—had Christianity reached the region. In any case, even if some missionaries, of whom we know nothing, reached this land, there are no traces of their activity.

The church organization was thus created *in cruda radice*, and the people who determined its form did not have to contend with any prior legal arrangements, nor could they refer to them, for none existed. When in the 9th century a diocesan network was being established in the lands that were within Moravia's sphere of influence, some role was played by the fact that there had been ecclesiastical structures in Antiquity in the areas in question. Although during the Migration Period they disappeared completely, memory of them had survived and they became an argument used in the dispute between the Holy See and Bavarian bishops. The papacy unwaveringly stood by the position whereby if in ancient times the lands in question had been part of the province with its metropolitan see in Sirmium, the claims of the Salzburg province to supremacy over these lands were groundless.[5]

There were no such reminiscences in the Polanian state. This does not mean that it existed in some ecclesiastical and political vacuum. When Mieszko I was adopting Christianity, the western border of his dominion was the eastern frontier of the Mainz province, while the border with Bohemia was also the border with the Salzburg province. Over the following decade the situation changed insofar as the eastern frontier of Saxony as well as Polabia became

---

4   Thietmar, lib. IV, cap. 45, 184.
5   Eggers, "Das Erzbistum des Method. Lage," 17–34; cf. however a somewhat different view of Peri, "Il mandato missionario".

part of the newly created Magdeburg province, while the Bohemian dioceses established in that period became part of the province of Mainz. People who determined the fate of the Polish Church had to take into account the rights, interests and aspirations of the neighbouring Churches. Their organizational, political and intellectual potential was so huge, their religious authority so considerable, their relations with the German king, the most powerful ruler in Latin Europe, so close that the position of these archbishops could not be disregarded.

The first mission arriving in Poland in connection with Mieszko I's baptism or shortly after that may have been based at the royal court. It must have been authorized by the pope to spread the Word of God among the peoples recognizing the supremacy of the Polanian ruler. At some point, which is difficult to capture, the missionary territory was transformed into a diocese and the head of the mission became the bishop of that diocese. This must have happened before 999. Whether it occurred as early as Jordan's times remains an open question, although I would be inclined to reply in the affirmative. On the other hand, there is no doubt that this diocese was directly subordinated to the Holy See.[6] It was part of neither the Magdeburg province[7] nor the Mainz province.[8]

The founding of a single bishopric remaining outside the metropolitan structure was a temporary solution. One diocese was not enough for the needs of the Polish state, whose territory was growing constantly, so much so that in the 990s its northern border reached the Baltic Sea and the southern—the

---

6   Weiss, *Biskupstwa bezpośrednio*, 255–259.

7   Since Paul Kehr's treatise, *Das Erzbistum Magdeburg und die erste Organisation der christlichen Kirche in Polen*, Abhandlungen der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-Historische Klasse 1 (Berlin: Verlag der Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1920), this view has been nearly universally accepted in Polish historiography. German scholars were initially reluctant to accept it (an overview of studies—Banaszak, "Charakter prawny biskupów Jordana i Ungera," 50–60); today it is quite widely—but not completely—recognized.

8   Referring to Tadeusz Wojciechowski's position, Tadeusz Wasilewski has recently spoken in favour of the subordination to the Metropolitan See of Mainz, Tadeusz Wasilewski, "Pierwsze biskupstwo polskie z siedzibą w Poznaniu," in *Ludzie, Kościół, wierzenia. Studia z dziejów kultury i społeczeństwa Europy Środkowej (średniowiecze—wczesna epoka nowożytna)*, ed. Wojciech Iwańczak and Stefan Krzysztof Kuczyński (Warsaw: Wydawnictwo DiG, 2001), 63–70. This author also believes that Mainz ceded its right to supremacy over Poland to Magdeburg in 1004. These theses are not convincing. The author has not explained why Magdeburg sources from the early 11th century do not mention the supremacy of the Archbishopric of Mainz over Poznań, creating instead a fictitious subordination of the bishopric to Magdeburg—a dependency that allegedly went back as far as 968. Invoking an authentic legal basis would have meant a greater chance of success during the negotiations in Rome than using false data.

Sudetes and the Carpathians. On the other hand, in the light of canon law in force at the time, bishoprics were to be grouped into church provinces and subordinated to archbishops. Thus, Poland had to be included in a metropolitan organization. The need arose when one Polish diocese was established, becoming urgent when there were to be more dioceses.

The problem was, however, where the see of this province was to be located: in the Piast state or outside it. In other words: would a Polish province be established or would Poland be subordinated to a foreign archbishopric? The interests of the ruling dynasty and its state, the good of the evangelizing work and of the Church required a local metropolitan see. Yet this did not depend only on a decision of the Piast court. Two other entities had the greatest say in the matter—the emperor and the Holy See.

What also mattered was the attitude of some local Churches in the neighbourhood of Poland. Before being incorporated into the Piast state, the territory of southern Poland belonged to Bohemia,[9] so at least theoretically it was subordinated to the Bishopric of Prague (at some point of Prague and Moravia) and thus was part of the Province of Mainz. In such circumstances the founding of a Polish church province encompassing the entire territory of the Piast state required the consent of the head of the archbishopric in question. The Magdeburg province did not have any rights to the territories situated east of the Odra River. It did have—and I will write more about this—far-reaching aspirations and claims arising from them. It did not, therefore, create any legal obstacle, but it did constitute a political problem. Finally, the establishment of a province encompassing the entire Piast state was a blow to the interests of the Diocese of Prague, which stood to lose its northern territories.

The task facing the Gniezno court was not an easy one. Gniezno had to obtain the approval of the Holy See, win over the emperor to its plans and neutralize any possible counteractions by foreign (Bohemian and German) Churches.

The founding of an archbishopric in Poland may have been considered already by Mieszko I. The question is whether and to what extent the donation of Gniezno to St. Peter around 990 was to make this task easier. The literature—very extensive and covering a number of topics—dedicated to the so-called *Dagome iudex* act emphasizes various motives allegedly guiding

---

9 However, we need to note an opposing view, expressed recently by a medievalist combining the competences of a historian in the strict sense of the term and those of an archaeologist: Elżbieta Kowalczyk, "Momenty geograficzne państwa Bolesława Chrobrego. Na styku historii i archeologii," *Kwartalnik Historyczny* 107 (2000), no. 2: 65–67, 69–73.

the old prince. It is not worth examining the relevant theses here at this point.[10] We do, however, need to stress that by offering his land to the Prince of the Apostles, Mieszko may have been guided by several considerations simultaneously. A desire to organize the Polish Church in accordance with his own interests may have been one of them.

The Bavarian bishops accused Methodius using the following words: "You are teaching in our land. He answered: I would not have entered it had I known that it was yours [the land], but it belongs to St. Peter. Indeed, if out of pride and greed you go outside the old frontiers against the [church] Law, preventing the teaching of [the word of] God, beware that you might spill your brains, wanting to pierce an iron mountain with your boney skulls".[11] The fragment of the *Life of Methodius* quoted here is highly instructive. It makes us realize that ownership of a country vested in St. Peter has some very real consequences. That country could not belong to a foreign ecclesiastical province, and the archbishop and bishops of that province could not exercise jurisdiction in the country. The idea behind this must have been as follows: if a local Church operated in a land belonging to the Prince of the Apostles, it had to be subordinated directly to him, that is, in practice to the Holy See. In order to observe this principle, the country in question had to have a separate metropolitan organization.

It is not easy to say whether Mieszko I was aware of such implications when he offered his state to St. Peter and whether the Roman Curia officials remembered this principle at the time. It is, however, possible.[12] In such a

---

10   The most important views on the matter and the most important works dealing with the subject are discussed in Gerard Labuda, "Znaczenie prawno-polityczne dokumentu 'Dagome iudex'," *Nasza Przeszłość* 4 (1948): 33–60; Piotr Bogdanowicz, "Geneza aktu dyplomatycznego zwanego Dagome iudex," *Roczniki Historyczne* 25 (1959): 9–33; Gerard Labuda, "Znaczenie prawne i polityczne dokumentu Dagome iudex," *Studia i materiały do dziejów Wielkopolski i Pomorza* 13 (1979), no. 1(25): 83–100; Charlotte Warnke, "Ursachen und Voraussetzungen der Schenkung Polens an den heiligen Petrus," in *Europa Slavica— Europa Orientalis. Festschrift für Herbert Ludat zum 70. Geburtstag*, ed. Klaus-Detlev Grothusen and Klaus Zernack, Osteuropa Studien der Hochschulen des Landes Hessen, Reihe I. Giessener Abhandlungen zur Agrar- und Wirtschaftforschung des Europäische Ostens 100 (Berlin: Duncker und Humblot, 1980), 127–177; Labuda, *Studia nad początkami państwa polskiego*, vol. 2, 240–263. I have presented my point of view in Michałowski, *Princeps fundator*, 60–61.

11   *Żywot Metodego*, in *Żywoty Konstantyna i Metodego*, Polish translation of the *Life of Methodius* by Tadeusz Lehr-Spławiński (Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Alfa, 2000), cap. 9, 111–113. See Warnke, "Ursachen und Voraussetzungen," 162; Eggers, "Das Erzbistum des Method. Lage," 32–33.

12   Charlotte Warnke is fully convinced of this, see Warnke, "Ursachen und Voraussetzungen," passim; see also Henryk Łowmiański, *Początki Polski*, vol. 5 (Warsaw: Państwowe

case *Dagome iudex* would have to be viewed as a document paving the way for the founding of a Polish church province. Thus, we need to take into account the fact that negotiations may have already started by that time with the Bishop of Prague and the Metropolitan of Mainz in order to persuade the two dignitaries to relinquish their claims to Silesia. Did these negotiations really take place and did they bring any results—we do not know.[13]

In order for a church province to be established, it had to have some territorial base. Highly instructive from this point of view are bulls by Leo III issued in connection with the elevation of Salzburg to the rank of archbishopric (JE 2495 and 2503). I have already pointed elsewhere to an argument used by the pope to justify the need to establish the see in question.[14] Charlemagne—says Leo—established and organized the Bavarian province, which is why he, the pope, feels bound to establish and organize it in the supernatural order. In order to give his words greater authority, the author of the bull invokes the principles of canon law.

The bulls quoted here reflect a conviction, quite popular in the early Middle Ages, that each secular province should also be an ecclesiastical province.[15] But, if understood in this way, a province is not some freely measured up and

---

Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1973), 604–605; The possibility is rejected by Labuda, *Studia nad początkami*, vol. 2, 477–478 (with a presentation of the positions of earlier Polish scholars).

13   Both Charlotte Warnke and Dušan Třeštík maintain that it was exactly at that time that St. Adalbert gave up his claims to areas situated north of the Sudetes and the Carpathians. See Warnke, "Ursachen und Vorausetzungen," 158–161; Dušan Třeštík, "Von Svatopulk zu Bolesław Chrobry. Die Enstehung Mitteleuropas des Tatsächlichen und aus einer Idee," in *The Neighbours of Poland in the 10th Century*, ed. Przemysław Urbańczyk (Warsaw: Institute of Archaeology and Ethnology Polish Academy of Sciences, 2000), 130–139. It is worth referring in this context to Johannes Fried's hypothesis according to which the founding of a Slavic province was considered by Empress Theophanu ("Theophanu und die Slawen. Bemerkungen des Ostens und Westens um die Wende des ersten Jahrhunderts," in *Kaiserin Theophanu. Begegnung des Ostens und Westens um die Wende des ersten Jahrtausends*, ed. Anton von Euw and Peter Schreiner, vol. 2 (Cologne: Das Museum, 1991), 361–370, especially 369). Among the arguments used by this historian in support of this concept, we should certainly note the fact that the great monastery in Memblen founded by the imperial couple was for some time headed by the Polish Bishop Unger. This is indeed interesting but not in itself sufficient enough to substantiate the hypothesis in question.

14   Chapter I, point 3.

15   Robert L. Benson, "Provincia=Regnum," in *Prédication et propagande au Moyen Age. Islam, Byzance, Occident*, ed. George Makdisi, Dominique Sourdel, and Janine Sourdel-Thomine, Penn-Paris-Dumbarton Oaks Colloquia 3 (Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1983), 41–69.

disordered space. The Bavarii had long had their own country, but, as the pope's words suggest, it was not until Charlemagne that it was properly organized and only at this moment did it become worthy of having an archbishopric.

The last decades of the 10th century were a period in which the Polish "province" was taking shape. We can distinguish two stages in this process. First, there was a political integration of a huge territorial bloc, with the Polanians at its centre and with the Polanian forces making it happen. It was carried out largely by military means, but was accompanied by migrations and great investment projects, such as the construction of new strongholds. These projects—like the migrations of people the scale of which we are unable to assess—had strategic objectives and effects. However, we should not disregard the consequences affecting people's minds. Archaeologists have pointed out, for example, the following phenomenon: sometimes large strongholds were built from scratch in the conquered areas and the conquerors located in them their administrative centres, disregarding at the same time old tribal sites, thus condemning them to extinction. It is obvious that in such circumstances the awareness of local communities began to focus on the new centres, which were associated with the Piast rule, while the memory of old tribal arrangements became increasingly blurred as time went by. Consequently, tribal identity was becoming ever less important.[16]

Whether and to what extent these effects were intended by the Polanian rulers remains an open question. On the other hand, we can be sure that they were well aware of how significant national identity was and tried to shape it. It is highly likely that when he decided to introduce Christianity, Mieszko I was guided by, among others, the hope that in this way he would create a shared point of reference for his subjects coming from various tribes and peoples.[17] We can easily point to another venture undertaken without any doubt to bring about a national unification.

Historians noted a long time ago that the names "Poland" and "Poles" appeared in sources for the first time only around 1000.[18] Earlier, the Piast state and its inhabitants were described by a variety of names. Authors wrote about Mieszko's state, the Gniezno state, the Licicaviki, Slavdom and, finally, the Slavs.

---

16   See my remarks: Roman Michałowski, "La Christianisation de la Pologne aux Xe–XIIe siècles," in *Clovis. Histoire et mémoire*, ed. Michel Rouche, vol. 2: *Le Baptême de Clovis, son écho à travers l'histoire* (Paris: Presses de l'Université de Paris-Sorbonne, 1997), 425–426.

17   Trawkowski, "Początki Kościoła," 55–56.

18   Henryk Łowmiański, *Początki Polski*, vol. 6, 1 (Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1985), 21–23; Labuda, *Studia nad początkami*, vol. 2, 461–463. I have presented my point of view in Michałowski, "Początki arcybiskupstwa gnieźnieńskiego," 34–36.

New names emerged suddenly, very quickly replacing all the others. There is no doubt that we are dealing here with a decision by Bolesław Chrobry. He decided to extend the name of his own tribe, on the basis of which the Piasts had created a powerful state, to include all his subjects. This was an attempt to integrate various tribal and ethnic elements into one nation.

These are the categories in terms of which we should interpret a unique legal act in the form of imposition on the people of Poland of a nine-week Lent.[19] Only Bolesław Chrobry's subjects were obliged to begin the period of abstinence from meat as early as the first Monday after the Septuagesima. Other Christians of the Latin rite did not give up meat until Ash Wednesday. By issuing the relevant decree, Bolesław may have been motivated by a variety of factors. It is highly likely that they included a desire to unite all his subjects, regardless of their ethnic origins, into one community.

The legal act in question was issued after the Summit of Gniezno rather than before it. However, the names "Poland" and "Poles" may have begun to spread earlier, before Otto III set out on his pilgrimage to the tomb of St. Adalbert. We could see in this an attempt to transform a conglomerate of lands and peoples ruled by the Polanian prince into one "province", making it worthy of having an archbishopric.

Dagome iudex and the spread of the name "Poland" pose the same dilemma to scholars. Both facts may have been an attempt on the part of the Piast prince to pave the way for the establishment of his own metropolitan organization. However, this cannot be proved beyond any doubt.

2   An Overview of Events

The course of events associated with the establishment of the Archbishopric of Gniezno has been known for a long time and there is little likelihood that we can significantly expand our knowledge of the subject even with the most careful analysis of the sources. On the other hand, we can expect much from attempts to understand better the ideological and religious determinants of the founding of the Polish church province. And this is the subject to which the present book is ultimately devoted. However, when it comes to the facts themselves, the chances that we will get to know them better are minimal. Yet if, in spite of all this, we continue to reconstruct the most basic facts, it is because recently a vision has been proposed, challenging what has been accepted for

---

19   Roman Michałowski, "The Nine-Week Lent in Boleslaus the Brave's Poland. A Study of the First Piasts' Religious Policy," *Acta Poloniae Historica* 89 (2004): 5–50.

years.[20] It is an erroneous vision, justly criticized by competent scholars.[21] I do not think I could add anything significant to this criticism. Nevertheless, it is my duty to explain why I believe that the traditional views are correct.

There are very few sources shedding light on the beginnings of the Archbishopric of Gniezno and those that are available cannot satisfy our curiosity. Particularly regrettable is the fact that Sylvester II's founding bull has not survived, nor has a separate report—if such a document existed—of the synodal meeting during which Gniezno was elevated to the rank of metropolitan see. And yet, for all the scarcity of the surviving sources, their number and their reliability are sufficient for us easily to reconstruct the main facts associated with the founding of the archbishopric.

Thus, court records dated Rome, 2 December 999, and containing the emperor's ruling in a property dispute involving the monastery of Farfa, twice

---

20   Johannnes Fried, *Otto III. und Boleslaw Chrobry. Das Widmungsbild des Aachener Evangeliars, der "Akt von Gnesen" und das frühe polnische und ungarische Königtum. 2., durchgesehene und erweiterte Aufgabe*, 1st ed. 1989 (Stuttgart: F. Steiner, 2001); see also a hypothetical outline of the beginnings of the Archbishopric of Gniezno, coinciding in some points with Fried's concept, presented by Przemysław Urbańczyk, "Paliusz Gaudentego," in *Viae historicae. Księga jubileuszowa dedykowana Profesorowi Lechowi A. Tyszkiewiczowi w siedemdziesiątą rocznicę urodzin*, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego 152 (Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wroclawskiego, 2001), 242–260.

21   See in particular Gerard Labuda, "Zjazd gnieźnieński roku 1000 w oświetleniu ikonograficznym," *Kwartalnik Historyczny* 98 (1991), no. 2: 3–18; idem, "O rzekomym zamyśle utworzenia arcybiskupstwa w Pradze w roku 1000—próba wyjaśnienia przekazu źródłowego," in *W kręgu historii, historiografii i polityki* (Łódź: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego, 1997), 237–244; idem, "Zjazd i synod gnieźnieński w roku 1000," *Kwartalnik Historyczny* 107 (2000), no. 2: 107–122; idem, "Der 'Akt von Gnesen' vom Jahre 1000. Bericht über die Forschungsvorhaben und Ergebnisse," *Quaestiones Medii Aevi Novae* 5 (2000): 145–188; Jerzy Strzelczyk, *Zjazd Gnieźnieński* (Poznań: Wydawnictwo WBP, 2000); Stanisław Trawkowski, "Wokół początków arcybiskupstwa gnieźnieńskiego," in *Ludzie, Kościół, wierzenia*, 109–123; Jerzy Strzelczyk, "Polen, Tschechen und Deutsche in ihren Wechselwirkungen um das Jahr 1000," in *Polen und Deutschland vor 1000 Jahren. Die Berliner Tagung über den "Akt von Gnesen"*, ed. Michael Borgolte, Europa im Mittelalter. Abhandlungen und Beiträge zur historischen Komparatistik 5 (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 2002), 43–59; Gerard Labuda, "O badaniach nad zjazdem gnieźnieńskim roku 1000," *Roczniki Historyczne* 68 (2002): 107–156. These works discuss the literature dealing with the founding of the Archbishopric of Gniezno. Among works quoted less often, see Zygmunt Marian Jedlicki, "La Création du premier archevêché polonais à Gniezno et ses conséquences au point de vue des rapports entre la Pologne et l'Empire germanique," *Revue Historique de Droit Français et Etranger*, 4e série 12 (1933): 645–695.

mention Radim-Gaudentius among the witnesses. His title is *archiepiscopus sancti Adalberti* (*archiepiscopus sancti martyris Adalberti* in the second instance).[22] On the other hand, when describing the Gniezno events of 1000, Thietmar says: "[Otto III] fecit ibi [i.e. in Gniezno] archiepiscopatum […], committens eundem predicti martyris fratri Radimo eidemque subiciens Reinbernum, Salsae Cholbergiensis aecclesiae episcopum, Popponem Cracuaensem, Iohannem Wrotizlaensem, Vngero Posnaniensi excepto".[23] In the last book of his chronicle, the author states: "Et pridie [i.e. 26 IV 1018] in suburbio Gnezni archiepiscopi illius aecclesia cum mansionibus caeteris comburitur".[24] In addition, the *Annals of the Cracow Chapter* contains two entries reading as follows:

> 1027. "Ypolitus archiepiscopus obiit. Bossuta succ[edit]".
> 1028. "Stephanus archiepiscopus obiit".[25]

Finally, Gallus Anonymus mentions a curse allegedly put by Gaudentius on Poland. As a consequence of this excommunication, he writes, the country became completely deserted.[26] Cosmas' chronicle also tells us that until as late as the end of the 1030s the tomb of the bishop in question was in the Gniezno

---

22   O III, no. 339, 768 and 769.

23   Thietmar, lib. IV, cap. 45, 184.

24   Thietmar, lib. VIII, cap. 15, 512.

25   *Rocznik kapituły krakowskiej*, ed. Zofia Kozłowska-Budkowa, MPH, Nova series, vol. 5 (Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1978), 46, the state of research is discussed there in footnotes 110–111 ("1027. Archbishop Ypolitus died. Bossuta succeeded him." "1028. Archbishop Stephanis died").

26   "Et tam diu civitates predicte [i.e. Gniezno and Poznań] in solitudine permanserunt, quod in ecclesia sancti Adalberti martyris sanctique Petri apostoli sua fere cubilia posuerunt. Que plaga creditur eo toti terre communiter evenisse, quia Gaudentius, sancti Adalberti frater et successor, occasione qua nescio, dicitur cum anathemate percussisse. Hec autem dixisse de Polonie destruccione sufficiat et eis, qui dominis naturalibus fidem non servaverunt, ad correctionem proficiat"—Gall, lib. I, cap. 19, 43–44 English translation: *Gesta principum Polonorum*, ed. Paul W. Knoll *et alii*, Central European Medieval Texts 3 (Budapest and New York: Central European University Press, 2003) 81—"The cities aforementioned remained so long deserted and wasted that wild beasts set their beds in the church of St. Adalbert the holy martyr and St. Peter the Apostle. It is believed that this disaster struck the whole land in common because Gaudentius, St. Adalbert's brother and successor, is said—for reasons unknown to me—to have placed the whole land under anathema. But let this suffice on the subject of Poland's ruin, and may it serve in corrections of those who failed to keep faith with their natural masters."

cathedral.[27] In the same fragment Cosmas refers to Gaudentius as archbishop of the city in question, that is, Gniezno.

The matter seems clear. Gaudentius was raised to the rank of metropolitan of Gniezno in Rome in 999, even before the emperor went on a pilgrimage to St. Adalbert's tomb. In March 1000 decisions made in the previous year in the Eternal City were put into practice and the Archbishopric of Gniezno began its work. It must have existed in 1018, if the settlement outside Gniezno's walls included a church of the local archbishop, and it must have still existed in the mid-1020s.[28] The Cracow annalist does not say where Hippolytus and Bossuta (Bożęta?) held their offices, but since they are mentioned in Polish annals and since the latter has a Slavic name, the only possibility is a see located in Poland, that is, at Gniezno.

Some believe that the Piast state had another metropolitan see. Under this premise, the two bishops may have just as well headed that other archbishopric. However, the existence of this other province, with its metropolitan see in Sandomierz, for example,[29] implies continued existence of the Gniezno see, in the sense that if Bolesław Chrobry managed to establish another church province, he must have been able to maintain the first one, with its see in his capital.[30]

––––––––––

27   *Cosmae Pragensis Chronica Boemorum*, ed. Bertold Bretholz, MGH SS rerum Germanicarum, Nova series, 2 (Berlin: Weidmann, 1923), lib. II, cap. 4, 89.

28   Arguments supporting the view that the Archbishopric of Gniezno really existed after 1000 are discussed by Jerzy Strzelczyk, *Bolesław Chrobry* (Poznań: Wydawnictwo WBP, 1999), 80–81.

29   Stanisław Kętrzyński, "O zaginionej metropolii czasów Bolesława Chrobrego," in idem, *Polska X–XI wieku* (Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1961), 289–351, especially 313–314.

30   The issue of the second ecclesiastical province in Bolesław Chrobry's Poland is discussed, with a reference to a clear overview of the state of research, by Labuda, *Studia nad początkami*, vol. 2, 526–548 and Wincenty Swoboda, "Druga metropolia w Polsce czasów Bolesława Chrobrego," *Roczniki Historyczne* 63 (1997): 7–15. The two authors' own thesis is minimalist. According to Labuda, that other metropolitan was the Archbishop of Magdeburg, and according to Swoboda—the Archbishop of Mainz. Gallus Anonymus (see the next footnote), to whom both authors refer, obviously meant something else: he wanted to say that the see of the two provinces was within the territory of Bolesław's state, just like the sees of bishoprics subordinated to them. Labuda and Swoboda may, of course, be right in looking for the see of this mysterious metropolitan outside Poland. The chronicler's account most likely reflected not so much the state of affairs, but some idea of it. A desire to glorify the person and reign of Bolesław Chrobry may have monumentalized a modest reality. If, however, we assume that Gallus's information is not accurate, we would need to reconsider the traditional interpretation, according to which it reflects the

In any case, the existence of this hypothetical metropolitan Church is very much doubtful, if, of course, we agree that its see was located in Poland. Firstly, what we know about it comes from the chronicle written by Gallus, an author not entirely reliable when it comes to his information about Bolesław Chrobry's times.[31] Secondly, it would be difficult to imagine that the archbishopric in question and its suffragan bishoprics could have disappeared without a trace. If they had indeed been established, then in the following centuries some ecclesiastical circles would have demanded that the archbishopric or one of its bishoprics be revived. If nowhere else, then certainly in Sandomierz the matter would have been raised. Instead, not a word was said. In addition, we cannot disregard the archaeological evidence, which is negative. In the eastern part of Poland, where the other metropolitan see was to have been located, there are no traces of monumental church architecture from the times of the first Piast monarchy. Neither in Sandomierz[32] nor in Płock[33] has anybody discovered a stone church dated to such an early period. The incredible find in Kałdus, that is, in early medieval Chełmno, would suggest the existence of a missionary monastery rather than that of an episcopal see.[34] It is not very

---

work in Poland of Bruno of Querfurt, a missionary bishop who was granted the pallium (see e.g. Władysław Abraham, *Organizacja Kościoła w Polsce do połowy wieku XII*, 3rd ed., posthumous (Poznań: Pallotinum, 1962), 142, although this scholar was inclined to believe that the missionary of the Yotvingians had organized his own province, a view which I do not accept). Bruno was not, obviously, the Polish metropolitan as understood by the oldest Polish chronicle. But neither were the Archbishops of Magdeburg or of Mainz. An attempt to link Bruno to the Gallus Anonymus's second metropolitan see has recently been made by Piotr Mateusz A. Cywiński, "Druga metropolia Bolesława Chrobrego a Brunon z Kwerfurtu," *Kwartalnik Historyczny* 108 (2001), no. 4: 3–15.

31   Gall, lib. I, cap. 11, 30: "Igitur rex Bolezlauus erga divinum cultum in ecclesiis construendis et episcopatibus beneficiisque conferendis ita devotissimus existebat, quod suo tempore Polonia duos metropolitanos cum suis suffraganeis continebat" ("King Bolesław was deeply devoted to religion, building churches and establishing episcopal sees and granting endowments; so much indeed, that in his days Poland had two metropolitans along with their suffragans"—*Gesta principum Polonorum*, 55).

32   Andrzej Buko, *Początki Sandomierza* (Warsaw: Instytut Archeologii i Etnologii Polskiej Akademii Nauk, 1998).

33   Andrzej Gołembnik, "Początki Płocka w świetle ostatnich prac weryfikacyjnych i nowych odkryć archeologicznych," in *Osadnictwo i architektura ziem polskich w dobie Zjazdu Gnieźnieńskiego*, ed. Andrzej Buko and Zygmunt Świechowski (Warsaw: Letter Quality, 2000), 167–177.

34   Wojciech Chudziak, "Wyniki badań weryfikacyjnych i rozpoznawczych na ziemi chełmińskiej," in *Osadnictwo i architektura ziem polskich*, 85–100.

likely that centre of a diocese would have been located so eccentrically (near the Prussian border).

Returning once again to the information from the *Annals of the Cracow Chapter*, it must be noted that Hippolytus and Bossuta cannot be regarded as itinerant bishops who had been granted the pallium, *archiepiscopi* or *episcopi vagantes*, who roamed the trails of early medieval Europe. Stephen, whose death is recorded by the annalist under the year 1028, may have been such a bishop, unless he and Bossuta were one person with two names—Christian and Slavic—as is sometimes assumed. However, with regard to Hippolytus and Bossuta, the author of the annals writes that one was the successor of the other, which implies the existence of an office one took over from the other.

We do not know whether Gaudentius, as Gallus claims, did indeed excommunicate Poland. The chronicle is very biased and the context in which this piece of information appears suggests that the author may have been motivated by some kind of *arrière pensée*. It seems that Gallus mentioned the excommunication in order to condemn those who had demanded ecclesiastical penalties to be imposed on Bolesław the Wrymouth or had, in fact, imposed them. It may, therefore, be true that the story of the curse is pure fabrication. One thing is certain though: Gaudentius was still remembered in Poland as a high-ranked cleric working locally. Finally, the last piece of evidence: if Radim was buried in Gniezno cathedral, this is where he most probably had held his office.

As we can see, the sources present us with a coherent body of information about the founding of the Archbishopric of Gniezno. However, the problem is that the veracity of this information, all of the facts one by one, has been recently questioned. The most consistent and strong criticism is by Johannes Fried,[35] although some scholars, both Polish and foreign, had earlier raised their objections.[36]

---

35   Fried, "Otto III. und Boleslaw Chrobry," especially 86–124; idem, "Gnesen—Aachen—Rom. Otto III. und der Kult des hl. Adalbert. Beobachtungen zum älteren Adalbertsleben," in *Polen und Deutschland*, 273–279.

36   Uhlirz, *Otto III.*, 310–313, 317–320, 326, 539–542, 556; Karol Maleczyński, "W sprawie zjazdu gnieźnieńskiego z 1000 roku," *Sobótka* 21 (1966): 507–540; Tadeusz Wasilewski, "Czescy sufragani Bolesława Chrobrego a zagadnienia jego drugiej metropolii kościelnej," in *Społeczeństwo Polski średniowiecznej*, vol. 5 (Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1992, 35–44 (this scholar formulated his concept even before the publication of Fried's book; he expressed his views in papers delivered in the 1980s). The erection of the Archbishopric of Prague at the Summit of Gniezno was mentioned already in the first half of the 19th century.

The German scholar first notes that in the court records of December 999, Gaudentius did not bear the title of Archbishop of Gniezno. Instead, what is given is an extraordinary moniker: archbishop of St. Adalbert. At the same time other bishops mentioned in the document as witnesses are referred to by the names of their sees, that is, following usual practice. This—according to Fried—testifies to the fact that in 999 the emperor and the pope had not yet decided where the metropolitan see of the new province would be located. Gniezno was not the only option that came to mind; Otto III and Sylvester II were more intent on Prague.

At this point Johannes Fried refers to the *Annales Hildesheimenses minores*. The entry under the year 1000 reads as follows:

> Imperator Otto tertius causa orationis ad sanctum Adalbertum epis-copum et martirem quadragesimae tempore Sclaviam intravit; ibique coadunata sinodo episcopia septem disposuit, et Gaudentium, fratrem beati Adalberti, in principali urbem Sclavorum Praga ordinari fecit archi-episcopum, licentia Romani pontificis, causa petitionis Bolizlavonis Boemiorum ducis, ob amorem pocius et honorem sui venerandi fratris digni pontificis martyris.[37]

As we can see, the annalist was of the opinion that during the Summit of Gniezno Gaudentius had been made not Archbishop of Gniezno but of Prague, and the ruler intervening in the matter had been not Bolesław Chrobry but Boleslav III of Bohemia.[38] The *Annales Hildesheimenses minores* was not

---

[37] *Annales Hildesheimenses*, ed. Georg Waitz, MGH SS rerum Germanicarum in usum schola-rum (Hanover: Hahn, 1878), 28 (Emperor Otto III entered Slavia to pray to Saint Adalbert, bishop and martyr during Lent. Having brought together the seven dioceses in a synod, he had Gaudentius (brother of Saint Adalbert) ordained archbishop in Prague, the lead-ing city of the Slavs. He did this with permission from the Roman pontiff, because of the pleas of Bolesław, Duke of the Bohemians; and even more than that, out of love for and to honour his venerable brother, the noble pontifical martyr").

[38] Drawing on the fragment from the annals quoted above, Wasilewski ("Czescy sufragani Bolesława Chrobrego," passim) has suggested that in 1000 two archbishoprics—Polish and Bohemian—were established and that Gaudentius became the Archbishop of Prague. An analysis of this concept would require a separate study. I shall present the matter briefly. In order for the concept to stand, we need to question Thietmar's assertion that Gaudentius became the Archbishop of Gniezno. This is the view of Wasilewski, who believes that the entry in the Hildesheim Annals was made already in 1000, while the Saxon chronicler was writing more than ten years later, i.e. that the version of events presented by the author of the Annals is more trustworthy. I find this difficult to agree with. The manuscript of

written contemporaneously with the events it describes but several decades later;[39] however, a similar entry, containing the same extraordinary information, can also be found in a 12th century *Life of St. Meinwerk*.[40] Lampert of Hersfeld, a chronicler writing in 1078–1080, filled the entry under the year 1000 with much more modest content. Without mentioning Otto III's pilgrimage, he wrote only that Gaudentius had been made archbishop. But he, too, mentioned Prague and not Gniezno in this context.[41] The inescapable conclusion in this situation is that this extraordinary information was based on a common source, that is the lost *Annales Hildesheimenses maiores*, records written down systematically around 1000.

Johannes Fried does not go as far as to claim that the Bohemian capital became the new metropolitan see. However, he believes that Otto III's candidature was Prague even as he was travelling to Gniezno and that the matter was settled only at the tomb of St. Adalbert. Why did the emperor change his plans? According to the German scholar, the monarch went to Poland hoping

---

the *Annales Hildesheimenses minores* comes from the 1040s at the earliest and we do not know how the entry changed in comparison with the original version written several decades earlier and belonging to the lost *Annales Hildesheimenses maiores*. On the other had, in Thietmar's case we have at our disposal his autograph. In addition, the chronicler himself was well-versed in Polish ecclesiastical affairs, for as a Magdeburg canon and then Bishop of Merseburg he was keenly interested in them. This is one of the reasons why I cannot accept Wasilewski's thesis. There are other reasons as well. No document asserts that two archbishoprics were established during the Summit of Gniezno; those medieval authors that speak on the matter mention only one. The additional sources referred to by Wasilewski are either meaningless (Kadłubek, *Polish Chronicle*) or their message is not clear. Gallus says: "Numquid non ipse [sc. Boleslauus] Morauiam et Bohemiam subiugavit et in Praga ducalem obtinuit, suisque eam suffraganeis deputavit" (Gall, lib. I, cap. 6, 16)— "Did not he conquer Moravia and Bohemia and win the seat of the duchy in Prague and appointed his suffragans to it (*Gesta principum Polonorum*, 31). According to Wasilewski, he speaks here of suffragan bishops subordinated to the Metropolitan of Prague. But the text suggests that they are Bolesław Chrobry's "suffragans" (whatever that is supposed to mean) and not the archbishop's, so it would be difficult to assume the existence of the Prague province on this basis.

39   Fried dates these annals to the 1040s ("Gnesen—Aachen—Rom," 274), Knut Görich to the 1060s: "*Ein* Erzbistum in Prag oder in Gnesen?," *Zeitschrift für Ostforschung* 40 (1991): 14; see also the latter author's extensive argument concerning the veracity of the entry in question, 10–27.

40   *Vita Meinwerci episcopi Patherbrunnensis*, ed. Franz Tenckhoff, MGH SS rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum (Hanover: Hahn, 1921), cap. 7, 11.

41   *Lamperti monachi Hersfeldensis opera*, ed. Oswald Holder-Egger, MGH SS rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum (Hanover and Leipzig: Hahn, 1894), 48.

that Bolesław Chrobry would give him the body of St. Adalbert. He wanted to bury it in the Bohemian capital. However, the emperor was to be disappointed when he reached his destination. Bolesław categorically rejected his friend's request. And since the archbishopric of St. Adalbert had to be established where its patron's body was buried, the only solution was to found the metropolitan see in Gniezno.

In order to give credence to his concept, the scholar invokes the Translation of Saints Abundius and Abundantius,[42] an 11th century source, as well as the Translation of St. Adalbert,[43] which the researcher firmly dates to the beginning of that century. The first work tells us that Otto III went to the land of the Slavs in order to obtain the martyr's relics and brought his arms from the pilgrimage. On the other hand, the author of the second Translation claims that the emperor went to Prussia, bought back the body of St. Adalbert and wanted to take it to his homeland. The people of Gniezno, which was located near the state's border, and of all regions of Poland firmly opposed this, saying that Adalbert had been a man who had done away with the cult of idols in their country and was the first to preach the Christian faith to them. The emperor was, therefore, forced to leave the saint's body behind, having to be satisfied with rather substantial pieces of relics. The body was buried in Gniezno, where a church was built from public funds to honour the saint. Thus—concludes Johannes Fried—we have evidence that Otto III went to Poland in order to fetch the martyr's whole body. If so, he must have wanted to found an archbishopric not in Gniezno but in some other city.

The German scholar goes further in expanding his theory. He maintains that in 1000 no Archbishopric of Gniezno was established. As Thietmar's *Chronicle* suggests, a protest against the founding of a new province was lodged by Bishop Unger, who had reasons to do so, because the new archbishopric was to be cut out of his own diocese. Examples from the period (Magdeburg, Bamberg) demonstrate that a protest by the incumbent bishop in such cases prevented a new local Church from being established.

Johannes Fried's ingenuity deserves respect, though it must be clearly said that his arguments are not convincing. The title *archiepiscopus sancti Adalberti* does not mean at all that there were some doubts as to the city in which Gaudentius' archiepiscopal see was to be located. What should first be noted is the fact that in the social circles in which Otto III moved titles stressing an

---

42   I analyze this source in greater detail below, see point 4 of the present chapter.

43   *E codicibus Varsaviensibus*, no. 2, ed. Wojciech Kętrzyński, MPH, vol. 5 (Lwów: W komisie księgarni Gubrunowicza i Schmidta, 1888), 995–997.

individual's bond with some saint were often used.[44] The monarch himself—
and I shall write more about this in greater detail later—officially referred to
himself in the last year of his reign as a servant of the Apostles (*servus apos-
tolorum*). In the records of the Roman synod of January 999, Henry, Bishop of
Würzburg and brother of Bernward, young Otto's preceptor, is presented as a
sancti Kyliani vicarius with no reference to the name of the city which was his
episcopal see.[45] Leo of Vercelli, a man from the monarch's closest entourage[46]
used the title of *Servus Eusebii*, also omitting to give the name of his see.[47]

The last two examples are particularly interesting. At that time Würzburg
and Vercelli were ordinary dioceses with their established sees and clearly
defined borders. Thus, the use of the aforementioned titles may have been dic-
tated by nothing more than just a desire to emphasize the strong link between
the incumbent bishop and his Church by a reference to the figure of its patron.
Indeed, St. Kilian and St. Eusebius personified their bishoprics. St. Kilian,
a missionary and a martyr, brought the Christian faith to Würzburg,[48] while
St. Eusebius—around 1000 also believed to have been martyred—was consid-
ered to be the most venerable bishop ever to have held the see of Vercelli.[49]
There are no reasons to doubt that this was also the case of St. Adalbert and
Gniezno: the martyr was a symbol of the newly founded archbishopric and
that is why the archbishopric was named after him and not because the choice
of its see had not been decided yet.[50]

---

44   Schramm, *Kaiser, Rom und Renovatio*, vol. 1, quoted after 3rd edition (Bad Homburg vor
      der Höhe: Hermann Gentner Verlag, 1962), 159.

45   *Ottonis III. et Gregorii V. concilium Romanum, MGH* Constitutiones et acta publica impera-
      torum et regum, vol. 1, ed. L. Weiland (Hanover: Hahn, 1893), no. 24, 52.

46   The links between Leo and Otto III have recently been examined by S. Gavinelli, "Leone
      di Vercelli Postillatore di Codici," *Aevum* 75 (2001): 235–238.

47   Hermann Bloch, "Beiträge zur Geschichte des Bischofs Leo von Vercelli und seiner
      Zeit," *Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde* 22 (1897): 108,
      also 95, fn. 1.

48   For information about the cult of St. Kilian, see Joachim Dienemann, *Der Kult des Heiligen
      Kilian im 8. und 9. Jh. Beiträge zur geistigen und politischen Entwicklung der Karolingerzeit*,
      Quellen und Forschungen des Bistums und Hochstift Würzburg 10 (Würzburg:
      Kommissionsverlag F. Schöningh, 1955); Knut Schäferdiek, "Kilian von Würzburg. Gestalt
      und Gestaltung eines Heiligen," in *Iconologia sacra. Mythos, Bildkunst und Dichtung in der
      Religions- und Sozialgeschichte Alteuropas. Festschrift für Karl Hauck zum 75. Geburtstag*,
      ed. Hagen Keller and Nikolaus Staubach, Arbeiten zur Frühmittelalterforschung 23
      (Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 1994), 313–340.

49   For information about the cult of St. Eusebius in the early Middle Ages, see Picard,
      Le Souvenir des évêques, 667–673.

50   Some scholars assume that no see was planned for Gaudentius, that he was to be
      either a missionary archbishop, like St. Boniface in the 8th century (Giulia Barone,

It is worth referring to another example. Tomasz Jurek has managed to demonstrate that Severus, Bishop of Prague in the 1040s, that is after St. Adalbert's body had been brought to the city, signed documents as St. Adalbert's bishop.[51] In this case, too, the reason was not uncertainty as to which see the bishop held—that was absolutely clear—but a desire to raise the prestige of that see by linking it to the person of the saint. This may have been connected with plans to elevate Prague to the rank of metropolitan see.

How the entry in the *Annales Hildesheimenses maiores* concerning the Summit of Gniezno read, when it was made and whether it existed in the first place—all this is the subject of a discussion that will probably never go beyond more or less plausible hypotheses. However, even if its content was identical to the entry in the *Annales Hildesheimenses minores* and was made in 1000 or soon after, its author was misinformed. After all, we know that during Otto III's pilgrimage to the tomb of St. Adalbert, Gaudentius was made Archbishop of Gniezno and not of Prague. Of course, according to Fried's theory, the annalist's knowledge concerned the emperor's plans and not their implementation. A question, however, arises: can we assume that the annalist was familiar with the monarch's plans, which could not have been known to the general public in their entirety, and knew nothing about their implementation, which must have been widely discussed across Saxony? Thus, if the analyzed entry in the annals was made by a misinformed author, it may be used as a source only with utmost care.

Johannes Fried is wrong in assuming that the Translation of St. Adalbert is an 11th-century source.[52] In fact, it comes from the late Middle Ages. Preserved in two manuscripts, one of which is from the 14th and the other from the 15th century, it is full of mistakes and anachronisms, which could not have come

---

"Wkład Sylwestra II w 'spotkanie gnieźnieńskie' (9 marca 1000)," in *Milenium Synodu-Zjazdu Gnieźnieńskiego*, Lublin: Instytut Europy Środkowo-Wschodniej, 2001, 62), or an archbishop in the imperial palace chapel—Przemysław Urbańczyk, "Zjazd Gnieźnieński w polityce imperialnej Ottona III," in *Trakt cesarski. Iława-Gniezno-Magdeburg*, ed. Wojciech Dzieduszycki and Maciej Przybył, Bibliotheca Fontes Archaeologici Posnanienses 11 (Poznań: Muzeum Archeologiczne w Poznaniu, 2002, 75. In both cases the argument is based on an erroneous interpretation of title *archiepiscopus sancti Adalberti*. Barone's interpretation has another fault as well: it does not explain why Otto III did establish the Archbishopric of Gniezno after all, as is unequivocally suggested by Thietmar.

51 Tomasz Jurek, "Losy arcybiskupstwa gnieźnieńskiego w XI wieku," in *1000 lat Archidiecezji Gnieźnieńskiej*, 52–53.

52 The scholar has fallen victim to the carelessness of Mathilde Uhlirz, who considers the document to be an early source. She has even gone as far as attempting to date it precisely, but thoroughly incorrectly: before 1039. (Uhlirz, *Otto III.*, 541, fn. 15).

from the pen of an author writing shortly after 1000. Stanisław Trawkowski puts it well: "Who would have claimed in Poland at the time that the head and body of St. Adalbert had been bought back by Otto III? Who would have come up with the idea that it was the emperor that received it ceremoniously at the gate of Gniezno, which was apparently located near the Prussian border? […] Would a church in honour of St. Adalbert have been erected in those days *publicis impendiis*?".[53] Would—let me add—anybody have claimed at the time that the Bishop of Prague was the first to have brought Christianity to Poland?

We can, therefore, conclude that the Translation of St. Adalbert cannot be used as a source to reconstruct the events from the late 10th and the early 11th century. When it comes to the Translation of Saints Abundius and Abundantius, it is not as significant as the German scholar claims. I will write more about this in point 4 of the present chapter.

Let us also note that the view whereby the Polish church province was not established owing to Unger's protest runs counter to the information provided by Thietmar. The fragment quoted above suggests that Otto III had the province established against the bishop's will. German analogies referred to in this context are not reliable. In the Empire the Church was a powerful institution and the episcopate was strong enough to oppose the ruler when he went against its interests, especially when he did so in contravention of canon law. We know in any case that the founding of the Archbishopric of Magdeburg was a threat to many in the German elite circles. Yet the situation in Poland was completely different. The Church, which had barely begun to put down its roots, was at the mercy of the Piast ruler. On the other hand, it would be difficult to say whom the founding of a Polish ecclesiastical province threatened, except for Unger himself and perhaps a handful of clerics associated with him. Faced with the pope, the emperor and the Polish prince, the Bishop of Poznań was on his own. True, he dared to protest, but when he was exempted from the authority of the new metropolitan, he probably never returned to the matter, though formally he did not withdraw his protest. He probably did not write letters to Rome, like William of Mainz, and did not repeat his protest during a Polish synod. If he had, he could hardly have expected a friendly attitude. On the other hand, the matter may have been raised again during Unger's imprisonment in Magdeburg. The bishop may have been persuaded to confirm his protest; it is also possible that he himself raised the issue, hoping for support from the Magdeburg clergy.[54]

---

53   Trawkowski, "Wokół początków arcybiskupstwa gnieźnieńskiego," 117.

54   There is no escaping the question of Thietmar's reliability regarding the information that is of interest to us in this case. The chronicler was biased, very critical of Bolesław Chrobry

If we try to take stock of Johannes Fried's argumentation, we will conclude that the German scholar's attack on traditional views concerning the beginning of the Archbishopric of Gniezno is not based on sources. On the other hand, we can cite two additional pieces of evidence supporting the traditional theory. They are less often given in the literature on the subject.

---

and, at the same time, he was a Saxon and Magdeburg patriot. Writing about Unger's protest, he created a situation convenient for Magdeburg, because in this way he questioned the legitimacy of the founding of the Archbishopric of Gniezno. We may wonder whether Unger protested at all or—as Jan Tyszkiewicz has suggested ("Bruno of Querfurt and the resolutions of the Gniezno Convention of 1000. Facts and Problems," *Quaestiones Medii Aevi Novae* 5 (2000): 199–200)—whether he voiced his protest only after becoming imprisoned in Saxony, under duress, which, of course, was not legally valid. However, this would be hard to believe. If we agree that in 1000 the bishop did not protest, Poznań's exemption from Gniezno's jurisdiction would be unexplainable. And the exemption cannot be doubted. The legal status of the Polish diocesan organization, which emerged following the events of 999–1000, was undoubtedly well known in German ecclesiastical and political circles, and it would be hard to believe that Thietmar dared to resort to such an obvious lie.

But perhaps the protest was indeed lodged, but its legal basis was different from the one suggested by the chronicler? His words suggest that Unger's opposition was based on the fact the Archbishopric of Gniezno had been established within the territory that belonged to the diocese which he himself headed. Trawkowski rejects at this point Thietmar's credibility ("Wokół początków arcybiskupstwa gnieźnieńskiego, 120–123). He justifies his position by noting that in 999 when the synod in Rome made the decision concerning Gniezno, the decision-makers must have had the consent of the Bishop of Poznań to the consession of a part of the territory of his diocese. The bishop's firm stance during Otto III's visit to Poland would have been prompted by the fact that in no way was Unger willing to agree to being subordinated to the Metropolitan of Gniezno.

This reasoning is based on an erroneous premise. As it established the Polish church province, the Roman synod did not have to have the consent mentioned by Trawkowski. When in 962 a decision was made during the coronation synod to establish the Metropolitan See of Magdeburg, William of Mainz did not give his consent. William of Mainz and Bernard of Halberstadt did not give their consent either when a similar decision was made in Ravenna in 967. That is why the Archbishopric of Magdeburg was not established until 968, after the death of the two bishops. This may also have been the case with Gniezno. Otto III and Sylverster II hoped that Unger's defiance would abate, when the emperor would face him in person and would demand it.

Of course, Thietmar may have explained the opposition of the Bishop of Poznań untruthfully in order to make it easier for himself to question the legitimacy of the founding of the Polish church province. However, historians cannot be too eager to accuse authors of sources of lying, because this would bring too much latitude to their research methods.

First, let us refer to the dating of the document issued by Otto III in Poland: "[…] actum in Sclavania in civitate Gnesni ubi corpus beati martyris Ad[alberti . . . . . re]quiescit […]".[55] Can we really imagine that the person dictating the diploma would have been so emphatic about St. Adalbert's burial in Gniezno, if the emperor had been forced to leave the revered body in the city in question?[56] The same message can be found in a sequence dedicated to St. Adalbert and written in Reichenau shortly after the Summit of Gniezno. The translation of the martyr's arm from Poland to Rome is described in triumphant terms.[57] Such a tone would have been out of place, if Otto III had expected to acquire the whole body. There is another detail. I shall try to demonstrate that the emperor brought to Poland an altar or, rather, an altar antependium to honour the martyr of Christ. It would be difficult to image that he brought the precious antependium to Gniezno only to send it immediately to Prague or some other city.[58] Everything seems to be suggesting that the monarch wanted the venerable remains to stay in Poland; if so, the emperor must have intended from the very beginning to establish St. Adalbert's archbishopric in that country.

In addition, we know very well—Thietmar's information cannot be questioned here—that an archbishopric was established in Gniezno, that Gaudentius was enthroned in Gniezno and specific suffragan bishops were subordinated to him. If we are to believe the information included in the *Hildesheim Annals*, a synod was convened at the tomb of St. Adalbert during Otto III's visit. However, it is impossible for that synod to have decided to raise Gniezno to the rank of metropolitan see and to establish the boundaries of the new church province. Such decisions were solely within the prerogatives of the Holy See. That is why we have to accept that even before the emperor set out on his pilgrimage to Poland, the relevant decisions had been taken at the Roman synod—decisions not only to make Gaudentius archbishop, but also to make Gniezno the see of the new archbishopric, to which Kołobrzeg, Cracow and Wrocław (perhaps also Poznań) were to be subordinated.

---

55   DO III, no. 349, 779 ("Given in Sclavinia in the city og Gniezno where the body of Saint Adalbert rests").

56   This was the argument put forward by Sławomir Gawlas during a discussion about Przemysław Urbańczyk's paper delivered in November 2001 during a doctoral seminar of Professors Antoni Mączak, Bronisław Nowak, Henryk Samsonowicz, Michał Tymowski and Andrzej Wyrobisz.

57   *Cantica Medii Aevi Polono-Latina*, vol. 1: *Sequentiae*, ed. Henryk Kowalewicz (Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1964, no. 1, verse 9a, 13–14.

58   See Trawkowski, Wokół początków arcybiskupstwa gnieźnieńskiego, 120.

In the end we need to ask: is it likely that there were plans to establish an archbishopric not in the country ruled by Bolesław Chrobry, that is, the ruler who was elevated to the rank of imperial associate in Gniezno? The answer must be in the negative, given the fact that having one's own church province was necessary for the holder of the office in question to be able to fulfil his duties, which involved, among others, the spreading of Christianity.[59] And is it possible that the archbishopric was to be located in Prague, hostile both to Bolesław Chrobry, and to St. Adalbert and the Slavniks?[60]

3   Otto III, a Servant of Jesus Christ and Adalbert the Martyr

When in 968 all obstacles that had hitherto prevented the foundation of the Magdeburg province were removed, Otto I appointed Adalbert archbishop and sent him to Rome. Adalbert did not need episcopal consecration, because he had already been ordained a missionary bishop of Rus' a few years earlier. A visit to the Eternal City was, however, necessary. In order to become a metropolitan, he had to receive the pallium from the pope, which happened on 18 November the same year. Yet the legal instruments comprising the investiture and conferment of the pallium were not sufficient for the nominee legally to assume his office. There had to be an enthronement preceded by an election. We should bear in mind that the ancient principle whereby a bishop was elected by the clergy and the people of the diocese was still in force. In Germany at the time, at least in the analyzed case, election was only a formality—the candidate was chosen by the emperor, who did not consult anybody. Yet the formal requirement had to be satisfied. Therefore on Christmas day, Saxon dignitaries gathered in Magdeburg cathedral to elect and enthrone Adalbert. In this last act they were accompanied by papal legates. After the ceremony the new archbishop consecrated his three suffragan bishops. By holding the two ceremonies together it was made clear that the Metropolitan of Magdeburg exercised authority over other bishops in the province.[61]

---

59   See points 3 and 6 of the present chapter.

60   Similar opinions are expressed by Barone, "Wkład Sylwestra II", 59–61 and Urbańczyk, "Zjazd Gnieźnieński w polityce imperialnej," 74.

61   *Urkundenbuch des Erzstifts Magdeburg*, vol. 1, no. 67, 97–98; see also Berent Schwineköper, "Die Regierungsantritt der Magdeburger Erzbischöfe", in *Festschrift für Friedrich Zahn*, vol. 1: *Zur Geschichte und Volkskunde Mitteldeutschlands*, ed. Walter Schlesinger, Mitteldeutsche Forschungen 50/I (Cologne and Graz : Böhlau, 1968), 191–192 (the author also mentions other sources dealing with the matter).

There are interesting analogies with the founding of the Archbishopric of Gniezno. We can guess that Gaudentius obtained his investiture from Otto III, that he was consecrated by Sylvester II and that he received the pallium from the pope before setting out on his journey to Gniezno.[62] The legal acts in question were not sufficient on their own. There had to be an election in the archiepiscopal see, there had to be an enthronement, there had to be an act of subordination of suffragan bishops to the metropolitan. Thus, the Gniezno events should also be viewed from this point of view. If in the above fragment (IV, 45) Thietmar said that the emperor had founded an archbishopric in Gniezno, he may have meant these additional legal acts. The presence of the oblationary Robert, probably serving as papal legate, in the imperial entourage[63] was necessary, as it had been in Magdeburg, to conduct the solemn enthronement. The bishops of Wrocław, Cracow and Kołobrzeg recognized Gaudentius's supremacy in Gniezno. Perhaps only then were they consecrated.[64]

The difference between the Gniezno ceremony and the one held in Magdeburg was that the emperor took part in the former. There were undoubtedly several reasons behind Otto III's presence and they certainly included the emperor's veneration for the martyr.[65]

---

62 Urbańczyk ("Paliusz Gaudentego," especially 254–255) believes that Gaudentius began to seek the pallium, in vain, after taking up the Gniezno see. Urbańczyk assumes that as he was leaving Rome, Radim was not and was not meant to be a diocesan archbishop. My assumption is the opposite. There are no grounds to doubt that Gaudentius received the pallium before setting out on his journey to Gniezno. It is true that often metropolitans went to Rome to receive the pallium or sent for it only after they had been enthroned, but this happened when they were elevated to the rank of archbishop, while being away from the Eternal City. On the other hand, it is also true that sometimes they would first go to Rome to obtain the insignia in question and only then did they travel to their see, where they were enthroned. This was the case of Adalbert of Magdeburg.

63 Kehr, *Das Erzbistum Magdeburg*, 36.

64 Barone doubts the presence of Gaudentius at the Summit of Gniezno ("Wkład Sylwestra II", 63). However, she does not explain how in such a case we should understand Thietmar's statement that Otto established an archbishopric in Gniezno and subordinated three bishops to Gaudentius's authority.

65 For information about Otto III's veneration for St. Adalbert, see e.g. Stanisław Trawkowski, "Pielgrzymka Ottona III do Gniezna. Ze studiów nad dewocją wczesnośredniowieczną," in *Polska w świecie. Szkice z dziejów kultury polskiej*, ed. J. Dowiat [et al.], Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1972, 107–124; Teresa Dunin-Wąsowicz, "Le Culte de Saint Adalbert vers l'an Mil et la fondation de l'église Saint-Adalbert à Liège," in *La Collégiale Saint-Jean de Liège. Mille ans d'art et d'histoire*, ed. J. Deckers (Liège: Pierre Mardaga, 1981, 35–38; eadem, "Di sequenza in sequenza: Adalberto, Reichenau, Gniezno," in *Clio et son regard. Mélanges offerts à Jacques Stiennon*, ed. Rita Lejeune and

The author of the oldest *Life of St. Adalbert* gives the date of death of his protagonist very precisely: "And the holy and most glorious martyr of Christ, Adalbert, was martyred on the ninth day before the Kalends of May, when the emperor was lord Otto III, the faithful and most glorious Caesar, on Friday".[66] In this form the date appears in the so-called imperial edition of the *Vita*, which was made at the royal court or at least was examined and supplemented there.[67] As we can see, the hagiographer thought it necessary to specify the reign during which the martyrdom took place. The information must have been of some importance to the German court.

Joseph Deckers (Liège: Pierre Mardaga, 1982), 189–198; Aleksander Gieysztor, "Politische Heilige im hochmittelalterlichen Polen und Böhmen," in *Politik und Heiligenverehrung im Hochmittelalter*, ed. Jürgen Petersohn, Vorträge und Forschungen 42 (Sigmaringen: Thorbecke, 1994), 332–333; Knut Görich, "Otto III. öffnet das Karlsgrab in Aachen. Überlegungen zu Heiligenverehrung, Heiligsprechung und Traditionsbildung," in *Herrschaftsrepräsentation im ottonischen Sachsen*, ed. Gerd Althoff and Ernst Schubert, Vorträge und Forschungen 46, Sigmaringen: Thorbecke, 1998), 407–412.

66   "Passus est autem sanctus et gloriosissimus martyr Christi Adalbertus VIIII Kalendas Mai, imperante rerum domino Ottonum tercio, pio et clarissimo cęsare [...]"—*Adalberti Vita I*, cap. 30, 47; English translation Cristian Gaşpar in: *Vitae sanctorum aetatis conversionis Europae Centralis* (*saec. X–XI*), ed. Gábor Klaniczay, Central European Medieval Texts 6 (Budapest and New York: Central European University Press, 2013), 181.

67   For information about various medieval editions of *Vita I*, see Jadwig Karwasińska, "Studia krytyczne nad żywotami św. Wojciecha, biskupa praskiego. III. Redakcje Vita I," *Studia Źródłoznawcze* 4 (1959): 9–32; eadem, *Les trois rédactions de « Vita I » de St. Adalbert*, Accademia Polacca di Scienze e Lettere. Bibliotheca di Roma. Conferenze 9 (Rome: A. Signorelli, 1960; Fried, "Gnesen—Aachen—Rom," 235–279. It is worth noting here a recent work by Vera von Falkenhausen, who analyzes *Vita I* in the context of the *Life of St. Gregory of Cassano* (*Vita s. Gregorii I*, BHL 3671 and the *Life of St. Alexius*, BHL 297)— Vera von Falkenhausen, "Gregor von Burtscheid und das griechische Mönchtum in Kalabrien," *Römische Quartalschrift für christliche Altertumskunde und Kirchengeschichte* 93 (1998), nos. 3–4: 244–247. The scholar's analysis suggests that the three works must have been written in the same milieu, i.e. most likely at SS. Boniface and Alexius' on the Aventine. The authors of all the *Vitae* mentioned here are well-versed in Italian-Greek monasticism and use in some respects the same hagiographic topoi. This is all the more important given the fact that Fried ("Gnesen—Aachen—Rom," passim) believes Notger of Leodium to be the author of the *Life of St. Adalbert I*. For information about the religious and intellectual atmosphere at the Monastery of Saints Boniface and Alexius, see Jean-Marie Sansterre, "Le Monastère des Saints-Bonifaces-et-Alexis sur l'Aventin et l'expansion du christianisme dans le cadre de la 'Renovatio Imperii Romanorum'. Une révision," *Revue Bénédictine*, 100, 1990: 493–506. Fried's position on the various editions of *Vita I* requires a more detailed analysis.

Other sources make it possible to find out why. Thietmar's account tells us that St. Adalbert's death made a profound impression on Otto III. When news of the events in Prussia reached the monarch, "he humbly offered praises to God, because, during his [the emperor's] lifetime, he [the Lord] had taken such a servant for himself through the palm of martyrdom".[68] These words should be interpreted in the light of another statement by the chronicler, concerning a similar situation. In a completely different context he mentions the death of Bruno of Querfurt, killed by the pagans in 1009, and the events accompanying it. He ends his description with the following remark: "These events occurred in the time of that most serene King Henry. Through the triumph of such a great bishop, omnipotent God had both honoured and, as I hope, saved him".[69]

What strikes us first is the meaning which the chronicler attributes in both cases to the fact that the event happened during the reign of this and not some other ruler. The reason seems simple: the chronicler was convinced that the

---

[68] Thietmar, lib. IV, cap. 28, 165–167: "Imperator autem Rome certus de hac re effectus, condignas Deo supplex retulit odas, quod suis temporibus talem sibi per palmam martyrii assumpsit famulum"; English translation by David A. Warner, *Ottonian Germany. The Chronicon of Thietmar of Merseburg*, Manchester Medieval Sources Series (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2001), 172. The meaning of this sentence is the subject of some controversy. The problem is who is the implied subject of the subordinate clause beginning with the conjunction *quod*: the *imperator* or *Deus*; in other words—whether St. Adalbert at the moment of his death became a servant of the emperor or of God. The first option has been advocated by Trawkowski, "Pielgrzymka Ottona III," 107; idem, "Eschatologiczny aspekt biskupiej służby królowi w ujęciu Thietmara," in *Nihil superflluum esse*, 95–100. This interpretation is opposed by Zofia [Kozłowska-]Budkowa, "Początki piśmiennictwa w Polsce, X–XI w.," *Analecta Cracoviensia* 7 (1975): 227, fn. 10. She accuses the author of not taking into account the fact that people in the Middle Ages overused the reflexive pronoun; she also suggests that Trawkowski's interpretation contradicts the meaning of Otto III's religious practices, which Trawkowski describes in the article in question (i.e. "Pielgrzymka Ottona III"), practices which expressed an attitude of humility and service to God and to St. Adalbert. Indeed, it would be difficult to agree with the interpretation proposed by Trawkowski. I would like to add the following remark to Kozłowska-Budkowa's arguments: if St. Adalbert had become a servant of the emperor, the chronological information—that this happened in his, i.e. Otto's times—would be incomprehensible. On the other hand, it does make sense, if we assume that the implied subject is the noun *Deus*: the monarch was happy that it was during his reign that God took such a great saint to his glory.

[69] "Facta sunt autem haec in tempore serenissimi regis Heinrici, quem Deus omnipotens triumpho tanti presulis honorificavit et, ut multum spero, salvavit" (Thietmar, lib. VI, cap. 95, 388; English translation by Warner, *Ottonian* Germany, 300–301). Cf. Trawkowski's remarks concerning this fragment ("Eschatologiczny aspekt," 97 f.).

saving power of death for one's faith embraced not only the martyr himself but also the current monarch. This is unequivocally suggested by the second fragment: Bruno died at a time when the kingdom was ruled by Henry, which is why we can hope that the monarch in question will achieve eternal life thanks to the martyrdom of the saint.

We can pursue this interpretation a step further and point to the characteristic stylization of the analyzed source. If Thietmar writes that through Bruno's martyrdom the Lord surrounded the king with glory, we cannot help thinking that the chronicler believes God to be the cause of martyrdom—of course in a higher, mystical sense—and that he is inclined to think that the Lord allowed the martyrdom to happen to honour Henry.

In the context of the fragment dealing with Bruno's death, we can better understand the reasons why Otto III's heart was filled with joy. Not only Adalbert but also he himself was chosen and honoured by God; not only the missionary attained heavenly glory, but the king, too, had a chance to achieve eternal salvation.

We know that Bruno of Querfurt carried out his missionary work, having been authorized by Henry II. We can, therefore, conclude that the death of the saint obtained God's grace for the monarch, because the latter contributed to the missionary ventures mentioned in the same fragment of the chronicle.[70] It would be difficult to deny that it must have had some significance. Yet in the quoted fragment Thietmar emphasizes not the functional but the temporal connection, not the fact that the king paved the way—in the noblest sense of the word—for the bishop's martyrdom, but the fact that the martyrdom happened during the reign of the king in question.

A confirmation of such an interpretation can be found in a letter which Bruno sent to Henry II.[71] When mentioning his successes in the evangelization of the Black Hungarians, the bishop shares the following conviction: "Hęc omnia sola gloria Dei, et optimi Petri; quantum ad me, nihil nisi peccatum, et hoc ipsum bonum perditum, nisi miserans Deus propter se faciat, augeat et addat propter sanguinem sanctorum et specialius eorum qui nostro aeuo effusus super terram".[72] We thus learn that the author attributes little merit to himself. The mission was a success thanks to God's grace and St. Peter's intercession. The bishop himself is merely a sinner. If there is

---

70   Trawkowski is inclined to accept such an interpretation, "Eschatologiczny aspect," 97–98.

71   *Epistola Brunonis ad Henricum regem*, ed. Jadwiga Karwasińska, MPH, Nova series, vol. 4, 3 (Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1973), 85–106. I shall examine the letter in greater detail in point 6 of the present chapter.

72   Ibid., 100/101; see also 98, vv. 8–9.

anything good in Bruno, it matters to the success of the evangelization only because the Lord makes it valuable out of consideration for the blood of saints, especially those who have been martyred in the present day.

The fragment encourages reflection in several directions. First, following the thread already started, we should note that the author attributed a salvific role not so much to the merits of all saints, regardless of when they had lived, but to the merits of saints who had lived and died recently. As we can see, there was a considerable similarity between Bruno of Querfurt's reasoning and that of Thietmar. When there was a question whether one could hope for the intercession of this or that man of God, both authors asked first, when the man in question had lived. In their opinion this was of crucial importance. However, just as important was the question whether this saint living contemporaneously had shed blood for faith. Bruno was inclined to believe that a missionary could seek support primarily in the merits of martyrs. A confessor's life of renunciation and his pious death mattered little, as we can see,[73] at least from the missionary's point of view.

Bruno's statements helps us to understand Otto III better. If God grants his grace to the world out of consideration for martyrdom—martyrdom suffered in the present, it has to be said—only Adalbert's death could fill the emperor with hope that heaven would bless him and his reign with its support. For Adalbert was the first martyr to be born for heaven during Otto's reign. It is, therefore, not surprising that the news of the death of the Apostle of the Prussians filled the monarch with such great joy.

In addition, the analyzed letter tells us that martyrdom procures God's blessing not only for the ruler, but also for other people living contemporaneously. The role of God's blessing involves a miraculous transformation of the little good that is in man into a great work. That good left to itself simply means nothing, and this is because human nature is riddled with sin. I shall write more about Bruno of Querfurt's pessimistic worldview elsewhere;[74] here it provides an additional argument in support of my conclusion.

However, in the light of the analyzed source it turns out that the bishop did see a chance of overcoming this evil. It was provided by the merits of martyrs. Not that they removed the evil, but they had the power to enhance human effort, which would be in vain without the intercession of the saints.

---

73   For information about the significance of the cult of martyrs in Ottonian times, see Marina Miladinov, "Hermits Murdered by Robbers: Construction of Martyrdom in Ottonian Hagiography," *Annual of Medieval Studies at CEU* 6 (2000): 9–21.

74   Chapter III, point 4.

Otto III was equally pessimistic about human nature or, to be more precise, his own nature. I shall examine this topic more thoroughly in Chapter III. A question now arises: Did the emperor hope, and if so, to what extent, that St. Adalbert's merits would be a remedy enabling him to overcome his own weakness? Was it not true that the objective of the pilgrimage to Poland was to overcome this weakness?

Let us try to look at the journey to Gniezno through the eyes of medieval authors.[75] They were in no doubt that its main purpose was to obtain St. Adalbert's intercession with God. The oldest of the sources is the *Life of the Five Brethren*. Bruno of Querfurt mentioned Otto's journey only in passing, not devoting even as much as half a sentence to the matter, but in the three words he used he did say that the emperor had gone to St. Adalbert in order to pray there.[76] Writing more or less at the same time, the Quedlinburg annalist said that the monarch "went, full of pious fear, to Sclavinia, to St. Adalbert, who shortly before that had gained the laurel of martyrdom for Christ, and begged him for his intercession".[77] The emperor's zeal in seeking the saint's intercession was all the greater given the fact that after the death of the pope, his grandmother and aunt Matilda, he was lonely and felt the burden of care for the Church especially acutely.[78] Thietmar begins his description of the pilgrimage with the following sentence: "Afterwards, the emperor heard of the miracles which God was performing through his beloved martyr Adalbert and made haste to go there for the sake of prayer".[79] The author of the *Annals of Hildesheim* speaks in the same spirit. "Emperor Otto III," as the annalist begins his account, "went to the land of the Slavs during Lent to pray to Saint Adalbert the Bishop and Martyr".[80]

The Polish tradition was less one-sided in approaching the matter. Gallus Anonymus presented its crux of as follows: "One further matter seems to me

---

75   An overview of sources is provided by Jerzy Strzelczyk, *Zjazd Gnieźnieński* (Poznań: Wydawnictwo WBP, 2000), 34–46.

76   *Vita Quinque Fratrum Eremitarum* [*seu*] *Vita uel Passio Benedicti et Iohannis sociorumque suorum auctore Brunone Querfurtensi*, ed. Jadwiga Karwasińska, MPH Nova series, vol. 4, 3), Warsaw, 1973, cap. 2, 33.

77   "[Otto] humili devotionem Sclaviam sanctum Adalbertum nuper pro Christo laureatum adiit, eiusque interventum obnixius petiit"—*Annales Quedlinburgenses*, ed. Georg Heinrich Pertz, MGH SS, vol. 3 (Hanover: Hahn, 1839), 77 (under the year 1000).

78   Ibidem.

79   "Postea cesar auditis mirabilibus, quae per dilectum sibi martyrem Deus fecit Aethelbertum, orationis gratia eo pergere festinavit" (Thietmar, lib. IV, cap. 44, 182). English translation by Warner, *Ottonian* Germany, 182–183.

80   *Annales Hildeshemenses*, 28 (text quoted above).

worthy of record. In his [Bolesław Chrobry's] time Otto Rufus went to visit St. Adalbert to pray and seek reconciliation, and at the same time to learn more of what was reported of glorious Bolesław".[81] Thus, it turns out that that as he set out on his journey to Poland, the German monarch was guided not only by spiritual needs, but also by secular considerations. But, after all, Gallus Anonymous, too, put devotional motives first, the difference being that in addition to prayer as the purpose of the pilgrimage he also mentioned "reconciliation" I shall try to explain later what he meant by this term.

Can we establish the particular object of the monarch's prayers for at the tomb of St. Adalbert? There are no sources that could provide direct information shedding light on the matter. However, we can, with a high degree of accuracy, specify the emperor's intentions as he was setting out on his journey to Poland. After all, we know quite a lot about what happened in Gniezno. But the easiest way to work out what these intentions were can be found in the titles used by Otto III during his Gniezno pilgrimage.

As soon as the emperor set foot on German soil, the following titles were introduced into the first document he issued in his homeland: "Otto tercius servus Iesu Christi et Romanorum inperator secundum voluntatem dei salvatoris nostrique liberatoris".[82] From that moment this intitulation appears in

---

81   Gall, lib. I, cap. 6, 18: "Illud quoque memorie commendandum estimamus, quod tempore ipsius Otto Rufus imperator ad sanctum Adalbertum orationis et reconciliationis gratia simulque gloriosi Bolezlaui cognoscendi famam introivit […]" (*Gesta principum Polonorum*, 35).

82   DO III, no. 344, 774. Schramm's book, *Kaiser, Rom und Renovatio*, 141–146, is of fundamental significance in this matter, too, and to this book I will refer first of all in my analysis. For more on the interpretation of the titles, see Albert Brackmann, "Der 'Römische Erneuerungsgedanke' und seine Bedeutung für die Reichspolitik der deutschen Kaiserzeit," *Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Philosophisch-historische Klasse 17 (1932): 358–363 (with the thesis according to which by assuming the apostolic title for the duration of his pilgrimage to Gniezno, Otto III polemicized with the Curia's concept of the evangelization of the pagans whereby the *missio ad gentes* was a matter for the pope and not the emperor); Jedlicki, "La Création," 658–659; Uhlirz, *Otto III.*, 543–544. Comparative material is also indicated by Josef Deér, "Das Kaiserbild im Kreuz," 1st edition, 1955, in idem, *Byzanz und das abendländische Herrschertum*, ed. Peter Classen, Vorträge und Foschungen 21 (Sigmaringen: Thorbecke, 1977), 174–176; Herwig Wolfram, "Lateinische Herrschertitel im neunten und zehnten Jahrhundert," in *Intitulatio*, vol. 2: *Lateinische Herrscher- und Fürstentitel im neunten und zehntnen Jahrhundert*, ed. H. Wolfram, Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung. Ergänzungsband 24 (Vienna, Cologne and Graz: Böhlau, 1973), 156. An important contribution, both in terms of interpretation and material, is provided

nearly all imperial diplomas, with minor deviations on rare occasions. The series ended with a document issued in Aachen on 15 May 1000.[83] The formula in question was also used in a diploma dated 30 July (Tribur) and then 6 July (Pavia).

When it comes to Latin diplomas, there are no analogies to these titles. There is no doubt that the main source of inspiration for the person dictating the text and for the political decision-maker behind him was the Apostolic letters, mostly St. Paul's. Let us compare:

"Paulus servus Iesu Christi, vocatus apostolus […]" (Rom 1:1) (Paul, servant of Jesus Christ, called apostle").

"Paulus apostolus Iesu Christi per voluntatem Dei […]" (Eph 1:1) (Paul, apostle of Jesus Christ by the will of God").

"Paulus apostolus Iesu Christi secundum imperium Dei salvatoris nostri […]" (1 Tm 1:1) ("Paul, apostle of Jesus Christ by the command of God our Saviour").

"Simon Petrus, servus et apostolus Iesu Christi […]" (2 Pt 1:1) ("Simon Peter, servant and apostle of Jesus Christ").

"Iudas Iesu Christi servus […]" (Jude 1:1) ("Jude, Servant of Jesus Christ").

As we can see, the usual imperial title of *Romanorum imperator* was combined with expressions by means of which the Apostles referred to themselves and their office. There could have been just one reason: the German monarch wanted to express his conviction that he was fulfilling the duties of an apostle. Imperial apostolicity was a well-known doctrine in Byzantine political ideology, although it was expressed by means of titles other than those used by Otto III. This does not mean, however, that in Otto's case we are dealing with a more or less mechanical copying of customs of the Constantinopolitan court. Scholars noted long time ago that the titles in question could be found only in documents issued during the Gniezno pilgrimage. The conclusion is obvious: these extraordinary titles corresponded to the tasks the emperor was to

---

by Tomasz Jasiński, "Tytulatura Bolesława Chrobrego na Zjeździe Gnieźnieńskim," in *Memoriae amici et magistri. Studia historyczne poświęcone pamięci Prof. Wacława Korty (1919–1999)*, (Wrocław: Instytut Historyczny Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego, 2001), 23–31.

83   H. Wolfram believes that in the period in question Otto III used only this particular intitulation and that it was given in the now lost original of the document issued in Gniezno, DO III, no. 349, 778–779. This view is based on the fact that only this intitulation can be found in original documents issued at the time, so we can conclude that when copies of diplomas from that period were made later, the formula was changed into one that was more "normal" ("Lateinische Herrschertitel," 156 with footnote 22 and 157).

perform at the time. We know that they were indeed apostolic tasks, involving the strengthening and expansion of the Polish Church and entrusting missionary duties to it. Thus the titles were used to describe very real duties performed by Otto and not to copy anybody or anything.

The material that Percy Ernst Schramm had at his disposal has recently been expanded to include a new element. We owe this to Tomasz Jasiński.[84] For decades the offices and titles granted to Bolesław Chrobry at the Gniezno Summit have been contemplated with admiration rather than analyzed matter-of-factly. Among them of particular interest has always been a function described by means of the term *cooperator imperii*,[85] which has disconcerted scholars somewhat. Medieval sources know neither an office nor a function bearing this name.[86]

Let us quote the relevant fragment of the source, which, as we know, was written by Gallus Anonymous: "Et tanta sunt illa die dileccione couniti, quod imperator eum fratrem et cooperatorem imperii constituit, et populi Romani amicum et socium appellavit".[87] Now, let us look at the *Letter to the Philippians*. At the beginning St. Paul calls himself a servant of Jesus Christ (*servus Iesu Christi*), whereas Chapter 2 (verse 28) contains the following

---

84   Jasiński, "Tytulatura Bolesława Chrobrego".

85   Gallus Anonymous's information that Bolesław Chrobry was granted the title of *cooperator imperii* in Gniezno is certainly reliable; see my remarks concerning the matter: Roman Michałowski, "Relacja Galla Anonima o Zjeździe Gnieźnieńskim—problem wiarygodności," in *Tekst źródła—krytyka i interpretacja. Kazimierz Dolny, 17–18 października 2003 roku*, ed. Barbara Trelińska (Warsaw: Wydawnictwo DiG, 2005), 55–62.

86   It is worth noting that in German historiography the term *cooperator imperii* has sometimes been equated with the term *consors imperii*; see recently Beumann, *Theutonum nova metropolis*, 207. Like other researchers, this scholar refers to the evidence provided by *Vita sancti Stanislai Cracoviensis episcopi* (*Vita maior*), ed. Wojciech Kętrzyński, MPH, vol. 4 (Lwów: W komisie księgarni Gubrunowicza i Schmidta, 1884), pars I, cap. 2, 365 and *Miracula sancti Adalberti*, ed. Wojciech Kętrzyński, ibid., cap. 9, 237. Indeed, when the Summit of Gniezno is mentioned in these works, the term *cooperator* is replaced with *consors*. However, Beumann's interpretation is unjustified, because the authors of these sources did not have any detailed knowledge of the events that had happened a quarter of a millennium earlier. Even more often German, sometimes also Polish, historians equated the notion of imperial associate with the notion of Roman patrician, a view rightly criticized by many experts on the subject; see e.g. Gerard Labuda, *Studia nad początkami państwa polskiego*, vol. 1, 1st edition, 1946, Uniwersytet Adama Mickiewicza, Historia 139 (Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu im. Adama Mickiewicza, 1987), 254–271.

87   Gall, lib. I, cap. 6, 19–20 ("And in such love were they united that day that the emperor declared him his brother and partner in the Empire, and called him a friend and ally of the Roman people"—*Gesta principum Polonorum*, 37).

sentence: "Necessarium autem existimavi [sc. Paulus] Epaphroditum fratrem et cooperatorem et commilitonem meum, vestrum autem apostolum, et ministrum necessitatis meae mittere ad vos". St. Paul talks here about Epaphroditus as his brother, associate and comrade. Readers of the Vulgate, at least not those who are modern-day specialists in New Testament exegesis, could also conclude from this sentence that this associate was an Apostle for the people of Philippi. Thus, there emerges a parallel between Paul and Otto III on the one hand, and Epaphroditus and Bolesław Chrobry on the other. First, we have a terminological parallel. The Apostle and the emperor are referred to by the same name, both are servants of Christ. Identical terms are also used to describe Epaphroditus and Bolesław: in both cases we have *frater* and *cooperator*. It would be difficult to believe that these similarities were accidental. On the contrary, it seems that Otto III interpreted his relation with the Polish prince through an analogy with the relation between St. Paul and Epaphroditus. Just as the man from Philippi assisted the Apostle of the Nations in the spreading of the Gospel, so too Poland's ruler was to help the emperor in the preaching of the Word of God.

The conclusions are twofold. Firstly, the religious nature of the functions entrusted to Bolesław in Gniezno appears even stronger than has seemed so far.[88] Otto III's apostolicity, too, shines even more brightly. It turns out that he defined his relations with other monarchs in terms of them helping him in fulfilling his religious duties. He went as far in this as to establish hitherto non-existing offices.

Otto III's titles analyzed here include one element that has no equivalent in either the imperial tradition or St. Paul's letter. I mean here the reference to God as liberator. Perhaps in this case the author was inspired by the Book of Daniel (6:27), according to which King Darius, when praising the Lord, used the term *liberator atque salvator*. Several questions come to mind in this context. Was it a conscious borrowing or, perhaps, a mechanical application of an expression? Let us assume that the first answer is correct. Another question arises. When referring to the Book of Daniel, did the author use only its lexical resources or, perhaps, did he also refer to its religious content?

Johannes Fried is in favour of the latter. His reasoning is as follows: The words *liberator atque salvator* come from a decree by Darius, a king ruling the whole world. Although he was a pagan, in his decree Darius praised the

---

88   Brackmann (Der "Römische Erneuerungsgedanke," 360) also says that Bolesław Chrobry as a *cooperator imperii* was supposed to help Otto in the ecclesiastical sphere. However, he derives this view from a doubtful premise. For him, the title in question was the same as that of patrician, whose duties included caring for the Church.

true God before all peoples. Otto III did the same, going for this purpose to Gniezno, which was regarded as the end of the world. In other words, the placement of liberator among his titles was deeply motivated by the mission the emperor wanted to accomplish in Poland.[89]

Such an interpretation would present the emperor's apostolic title in a new light. However, it would be difficult to deny that there seems to be too much liberty in this argument. The use of the word *liberator* itself does not justify such a thesis. In the end, the author of the intitulation may have wanted only to strengthen the term *salvator*, borrowed from St. Paul's letter.[90]

However, even without Fried's interpretation, Otto III's titles from 1000 are unequivocal thanks to the term *servus Iesu Christi*: it makes us realize how important for the monarch his missionary duties were.[91] A similar content

---

89   Johannes Fried, *Święty Wojciech i Polska*, Instytut Historii Uniwersytetu im. Adama Mickiewicza w Poznaniu. Wykłady 5 (Poznań: Instytut Historii Uniwersytetu im. Adama Mickiewicza, 2001), 35–36.

90   Fried (*Święty Wojciech*, 26–35) also suggests that in choosing the titles in question the person dictating Otto III's documents wanted to refer to the Book of Isaiah (Chapter 19), where God's double attribute of *Salvator-Liberator* features prominently. (Nb. these words are not used there; we have instead the expression *salvatorem et propugnatorem, qui liberet eos*). Moreover, in the opinion of the German historian, the emperor's journey to Poland was directed in accordance with the prophecy of liberation, i.e. in the Christian exegesis—conversion of Egypt, as the prophecy is presented in Isaiah, Chapter 19—and in accordance with his other prophecies. It seems, however, that Fried's claim is not sufficiently justified. For what were these similarities? Isaiah, for example, says that an altar will be found in the heart of Egypt. And the emperor really built an altar in Gniezno. There are two doubts, however. Poland was no longer a pagan country at the time, and the construction of an altar in the Gniezno cathedral does not have to be explained by a desire to fulfil Isaiah's prophecy. St. Adalbert, who was buried there, had to be honoured by his body being placed in a special confessio. On the other hand, says Fried, in Chapter 45 Prophet Isaiah foretells that Zion will be called by a new name and will be a royal diadem in the hand of God. During the Summit of Gniezno Bolesław's country received a new name, i.e. "Poland" and Bolesław himself was crowned king. However, the German scholar is incorrect. Otto III's document issued in Gniezno (DO III, no. 349, 779) gives the "old" name of the country, that is Sclavinia. If indeed Bolesław's country had received a new name, it would certainly have been recorded in the diploma. Secondly, it is not true that the Piast prince was crowned king at the time. Fried's argument is full of other liberties. The author is inclined to interpret Otto III's title of *servus Iesu Christi* not only through a reference to the Apostle from St. Paul's letter, but also to the Servant of the Lord from Isaiah's prophecy (Chapter 49). I do not think it is necessary. Fried's views are shared by Wolfgang Huschner, "Abt Odilo von Cluny und Kaiser Otto III. In Italien und in Gnesen," in *Polen und Deutschland*, 151–152.

91   See recently Ekkehard Eickhoff, "Otto III. in Pereum. Konzept und Verwirklichung seiner Missionspolitik," *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte* 83 (2001), no. 1: 25–35.

can be found in the intitulation which—evidenced only once—appears in a document issued in January the following year: "sanctarum ecclesiarum devotisimus et fidelissimus dilatator".[92] It emanates pride in the fruits of the Gniezno pilgrimage. During this pilgrimage the emperor established a church organization in a newly Christianized country and this fact was for him a claim to glory.

By treating his missionary duties very seriously, Otto III did not introduce anything new into the imperial ethos. On the contrary, he drew on a tradition which had its roots in a distant past.

The Roman Empire was an institution called to carry out the Christianizing mission—this was a view readily expressed in late Antiquity. Ideologists and politicians of the Carolingian era assimilated this opinion. They regarded Augustus' rule as providential, mainly owing to the fact that peace reigning in the period created favourable conditions for the spread of the Christian faith. Another very important Christianizing emperor was, in the light of this historiosophy, Constantine the Great. He was seen—essentially correctly—as a ruler whose decision ultimately determined the victory of the Christian religion. Such opinions were accompanied by a more general conviction concerning the providential role played in the economy of salvation—in the past and in the present—by the *Imperium Romanum*.

Already at the very beginning of his reign, Charlemagne realized that there was a link between the idea of imperial Rome and the duty to carry out missions among the pagans. He set out to Christianize Saxony after his first visit to the Eternal City and after conquering Pavia. Both events took place in 774 and were followed three years later by mass baptisms of the Saxons. Their venue was *Urbs Caroli*, a city erected by Charlemagne in the conquered country. There is no doubt that the Frankish king followed the example of Constantine the Great as a city founder and as an evangelizer.[93] The monarch was not yet emperor at the time, but in 774 he conquered northern and central Italy, and extended his protection to Rome. From that moment on he referred to himself not only as king of the Franks but also as king of the Lombards and Roman patrician. His hegemonic position in Latin Europe as well as his protection of Rome and the Roman Church accepted by the pope meant that Charlemagne was beginning to play the role of an emperor. The coronation of 800, the

---

92   DO III, no. 388, 818 ("Most devout and faithful propagator of holy churches").

93   See Roman Michałowski, "Prüm i Urbs Caroli. Monarsze fundacje na tle kultury politycznej wczesnych czasów karolińskich," in *Fundacje i fundatorzy w średniowieczu i w epoce nowożytnej*, ed. Edward Opaliński and Tomasz Wiślicz (Warsaw: Neriton. Instytut Historii PAN, 2000), 20–32 and the literature mentioned there.

significance of which cannot be downplayed, was a culmination of a process that had been going on for a quarter of a century.

The contribution of the Frankish king to the mission among the pagans and their evangelization is well known.[94] In addition to Saxony, which he not only baptized but in which he founded a dense network of bishoprics, we should mention countries in the Danube River Basin, which he began to Christianize with great energy. I have already written about the founding of the Salzburg province in a different context. The missionary work in which bishoprics of this province were involved bore visible fruit only during the reign of Charlemagne's successors.

Louis the Pious followed in his father's footsteps, focusing his activity on Scandinavia. On the emperor's order, a mission in the region was undertaken by Ebo, the Archbishop of Rheims, and then by St. Ansgar. With a view to evangelizing the Nordic countries, the monarch founded the Archbishopric of Hamburg, which for the following two-hundred years tried—usually doing very poorly—to Christianize Scandinavia. However, as early as in 826 it might have seemed that Louis would be able to convert Denmark to Christianity. Its king, Harald Klak, was baptized, together with his wife, son and large entourage, in the land of the Franks, probably at St. Alban's in Mainz, although we cannot categorically exclude Ingelheim. His godfather was Louis the Pious and the godmother of his queen—Empress Judith. A similar role with regard to the crown prince was played by young Emperor Lothar. Church celebrations were accompanied by state ceremonies. Immediately after the sacrament was administered, Louis the Pious clothed the Dane in the chlamys, a royal cloak, and put a crown on his head. Thus a royal coronation took place, followed, but not until the day after, by homage paid by the Danish king to the emperor.[95]

The events in Mainz did not have a follow-up, because Harald was dethroned soon afterwards. However, they did present Louis the Pious as the main Christianizer of Denmark. By acting as a godfather, he played an important role in the conversion of the Danish king and, at the same time, received the right to supervise the progress in the evangelization of the Danes. The godfather's task was to care for the salvation of his spiritual son. This was a general

---

94   Büttner, "Mission und Kirchenorganisation," 454–487.

95   Arnold Angenendt, *Kaiserherrschaft und Königstaufe. Kaiser, Könige, und Päpste als geistliche Patrone in der abendländischen Missionsgeschichte*, Arbeiten zur Frümittelalterforschung 15 (Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 1984), 215–223; Karl Hauck, "Der Missionsauftrag Christi und das Kaisertum Ludwigs des Frommen," in *Charlemagne's Heir. New Perspectives on the Reign of Louis the Pious (814–840)*, ed. Peter Godman and Roger Collins, vol. 1 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990), 274–296, especially 289–296.

principle, applicable regardless of the status of the latter. When, as in our case, the spiritual son was a ruler, his godfather had to extend his spiritual care to the entire Christianized nation, because a sinful nation might lead its king to eternal damnation.

However, the Christianizer was an emperor and when acting as the godfather, he also exercised the powers of Roman emperors. For instance, during the baptism ceremony of the hitherto barbarian prince, he elevated him to the rank of king. The secular aspect and the religious aspect were inextricably linked. According to the political doctrine inherited from Antiquity, every Christian was a subject of the emperor, therefore mission among the pagans and expansion of the Empire's borders were one and the same process.

However, we need to be moderate in our assessment. A ruler did not have to be an emperor in order to lead an evangelizing mission among the pagans. It would be easy to list many monarchs in early medieval Europe who were not emperors, but who distinguished themselves or at least wanted to distinguish themselves by converting other nations to Christianity. Yet there was a belief that missionary work was first of all the duty of the emperor, that the emperor was, above all, called to Christianize pagan countries. This idea, born in Antiquity and transferred to the Middle Ages by the Carolingians, was also cultivated by the Ottonians.

That Otto I made a huge contribution to the evangelization of the nations is beyond any doubt.[96] Let us recall the basic facts. Otto supported the mission in Denmark, crowned with the founding, with his contribution, of three bishoprics: in Schleswig, Ripen and Aarhus. First of all, however, he was very active in the lands of the Polabian Slavs that had already been conquered or were being conquered. There he created a whole network of dioceses, comprising the Bishoprics of Oldenburg, Brandenburg, Havelberg, Merseburg, Zeitz and Meissen. With the exception of Oldenburg, all were subordinated to the

---

[96] For more on Otto I's Christianizing work and on his ideology, see e.g. Heinrich Büttner, "Die christliche Kirche ostwärts der Elbe bis zum Tode Ottos I.," in *Festschrift für Friedrich Zahn*, vol. 1, 145–181; Kretschmar, "Der Kaiser tauft," passim; Angenendt, *Kaiserherrschaft und Königstaufe*, 274–300; Beumann, "Laurentius und Mauritius," passim; Michał T. Szczepański, "Religijne powinności władcy w polityce Ottona I do 962 roku," *Kwartalnik Historyczny* 106 (1999), no. 3: 3–33; Hehl, "Kaisertum, Rom und Papstbezug," passim; Michał T. Szczepański, "Fundacja misyjna. Uwagi o kształtowaniu się ottońskiej koncepcji władzy," in *Monarchia w średniowieczu. Władza nad ludźmi, władza nad terytorium. Studia ofiarowane Profesorowi Henrykowi Samsonowiczowi*, ed. Jerzy Pysiak, Aneta Pieniądz-Skrzypczak, and Marcin Rafał Pauk (Warsaw and Kraków: Towarzystwo Naukowe Societas Vistulana, 2002), 229–250; also numerous works dealing with Otto I's imperial office.

Magdeburg province, also founded by Otto I. All these dioceses, headed by the Archbishopric of Magdeburg, were established for missionary purposes.[97]

That was not all, however. Otto I began preparations for the founding of bishoprics in Bohemia; the task was accomplished a few years after the emperor's death. Otto also made a failed attempt to Christianize Rus' and took the first steps to convert Hungary to the Christian faith.

The monarch was in no doubt that this sort of activity covered him with glory. The records of the 967 Ravenna synod are characteristic in this respect. When justifying the need to establish the Archbishopric of Magdeburg, the emperor invokes pastoral needs: it is necessary to take care of the numerous Slavic peoples living beyond the Elbe, peoples that have just converted. This is where we can find expressions emphasizing the monarch's contribution: it was he who brought these numerous peoples to Christian faith, it was he who spared no effort, it was he who constantly exposed himself to danger.[98]

The records very clearly reflect Otto I's point of view (the person dictating the document was the Italian chancellor Ambrogio).[99] However, the matter could have been presented completely differently, as can be seen in another

---

97   See the preamble from the foundation document for the Bishopric of Brandenburg, DO I, no. 105, 189: "Quoniam quidem propagandae fidei amplificandaeque religioni Christianae cunctos indulgere fideles opere precium novimus […], in praedio nostro in marca illius sito in terra Sclavorum in pago Heueldum in civitate Brendaburg in honore domini ac salvatoris nostri sanctique Petri apostolorum prinicipis episcopalem constituimus sedem […]" ("For since indeed we know the price to be allowed to all the faithful for the work of propagating the faith and expanding the reach of the Christian religion […] we have created an episcopal see at our estate situated in the city of Brandenburg in the march of the county of Havelburg in the land of the Slavs in honour of our Lord and Saviour and Saint Peter, the leader of the apostles").

98   "[…] sanctissimus imperator Otto cesar augustus […] plurimas Sclauorum nationes ultra flumen Albię in confinio Saxonie multo se labore et maximis sepe periculis ad Christum convertisse coram omnibus retulit et, quia rudes et necdum stabiles erant, quia tuitione et custodia et cottidiana sollicitatione in fide corroborare deberent, sanctam synodum consuluit, rogans, ut quos ipse summo deo mancipaverat, pastorum negligentia ad vomitum redire non sineret" (*Urkundenbuch des Erzstifts Magdeburg*, vol. 1, no. 61, 84) ("the most holy Caesar Augustus emperor Otto reported before all that he had, at great danger to himself and by means of much exertion, converted all the nations of the Slavs in the neighbourhood of Saxony beyond the river Elbe. Furthermore, since they were wild and inconstant, because they would still need to be strengthened in their faith by care, watchfulness and daily concern, he consulted the holy synod, requesting that it should not permit those whom he himself had freed to the highest God return to their vomit because of pastoral negligence").

99   See Engels, "Die Gründung der Kirchenprovinz Magdeburg," 140.

account of the same synod,[100] which came from the papal chancellery. As can be concluded from John XIII's bull, the emperor asked all present how the evangelization of countries of the North could happen with Apostolic consent. The relevant sentence contains a suggestion that this applied to territories that were completely pagan at the time.[101] A response to the monarch's question came in the form of a decision, announced in the bull, to erect the Archbishopric of Magdeburg. In this context we cannot talk of the emperor's contribution to Christianization, because it had not been made yet. For all his political dependency on Otto, John XIII did not want to make any concessions in one question. The *missio ad gentes* was the work of not the emperor but the Church. Hence the emperor's request for the evangelization of Polabia to be authorized by the pope.

Five years earlier John XII was more willing to agree to a compromise. In his foundation bull for Magdeburg, he took the monarch's point of view as his own. Thus, readers learn from the pope himself that Otto I placed the Slavs, whom he had vanquished, on the foundation of the Catholic faith.[102] John XII even claimed—and we can hardly believe our eyes reading this—that the monarch had baptized the Slavic tribes and in the future would baptize those that were still pagan.[103]

Otto I had displayed a keen interest in evangelization long before he was crowned emperor. Nevertheless, he, too, was convinced that there was some

---

100 Walter Schlesinger, *Kirchengeschichte Sachsens im Mittelalter*, vol. 1, Mitteldeutsche Forschungen 27/I (Cologne and Graz: Böhlau 1962), 27–28; Claude, *Geschichte des Erzbistums Magdeburg*, 87–89.

101 "[…] idem sanctissimus inperator ardentissimo cępit amore perquirere, quomodo nostra apostolica auctoritate a primordio nomen Christianitatis in aquilonalibus partibus dilataretur"—*Papsturkunden*, vol. 1, no. 177, 348 (JL 3715) ("the same most holy emperor began with burning love to inquire diligently from the beginning itself how by our apostolic authority the Christianity might be spread in the northern parts").

102 "[…] prefatus piissimus inperator Otto, qualiter Sclavos, quos ipse devicit, in catholica fide noviter fundaverat […]"—*Papsturkunden*, vol. 1, no. 154, 283 (JL 3690) ("the afore-mentioned, most pious emperor Otto, how he had recently founded the Catholic faith among the Slavs, whom he had conquered").

103 "[…] volumus et per nostrę auctoritatis privilegium censemus, ut censum et decimationem omnium gentium, quas predictus piissimus imperator baptizavit vel per eum suumque filium equivocum regem successoresque eorum Deo annuente baptizande sunt, ipsi successoresque eorum potestatem habeant distribuendi […]"—ibid. ("we wish also to set a tax by the privilege of our authority, to the effect that he and his son and their successors should have the power of apportioning a tax and tithe of all peoples whom the afore-mentioned most pious emperor baptised or are, by God's grace, to be baptised by him or his son, also king, or their successors").

link between the office of the emperor and the *missio ad gentes*.[104] In 948 a synod was convened at Ingelheim. The matters it dealt with included the case of the Archbishopric of Rheims, specifically, the question of who had the right to hold that see. The city of Rheims was located in the Kingdom of the West Franks and Louis Transmarinus was among the participants, but the sessions took place in the Kingdom of the East Franks and Otto I had the decisive say, if not *de iure* then *de facto*.[105] Thus, the King of the East Franks was winning a hegemonic position in Western Europe, a position recognized also by the Carolingians. It was around this time that he emerged as a Christianizer *par excellence* for the first time. In the year of the Ingelheim synod, Otto I founded his first bishoprics.

In 951 Italy came under his rule. By marrying Adelaide, widow of Lothar, King of Italy, Otto I not only acquired the right to the Italian throne, but also took over the imperial tradition, cultivated by Hugh, Adelaide's father-in-law.[106] During his Italian expedition he also tried to obtain the imperial diadem from the pope. Although that request was rejected, Otto returned from Italy convinced that he was responsible for all Christianity. On his way back he convened a synod in Augsburg to debate the state of the Christian empire (*de statu christiani imperii tractare*) and discuss issues of concern to all Christianity (*totius christianitatis utilitates*).[107] As we can see, the imperial coronation did not take place, but the king performed the duties of emperor with full conviction. This is hardly surprising given the fact that he ruled not only both parts of the Frankish kingdom but also Italy. The Carolingian empire had now been revived almost in its entirety. In 953 Otto sent his envoys to the Caliph of Cordoba with a letter in which he tried to persuade the Arab ruler to change his negative attitude to Christ. Thus Otto fulfilled his duties of a ruler serving as

---

104   For information about Otto I's imperial ideology, see primarily *Otto der Grosse*, ed. Harald Zimmermann (Wege der Forschung, 450), Darmstadt, 1976, especially articles by Kurt-Ulrich Jäschke, Edmund E. Stengel and Hagen Keller published there. Among papers omitted from the collection, see first of all Beumann, "Das Kaisertum Ottos des Grossen," passim.

105   For more on this synod, see Fuhrmann Fuhrmann, "Die 'heilige und Generalsynode' des Jahres 948," 1st edition 1964, in *Otto der Grosse*, 46–55.

106   Odilo Engels, "Die europäische Geisteslage vor 1000 Jahren—ein Rundblick", in *Adalbert von Prag (956–997) Brückenbauer zwischen dem Westen und dem Osten Europas*, ed. Hans Hermann Henrix, Schriften der Adalbert-Stiftung 4 (Baden-Baden: Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft, 1997), 21.

107   *Concilia Aevi Saxonici. DCCCCXVI–MI*, part 1, ed. Ernst-Dieter Hehl, *MGH* Concilia, vol. 6/I, (Hanover: Hahn, 1987), no. 18, 189.

an emperor—duties to represent *christianitas* vis-à-vis rulers of other religions and to promote the Christian faith among the infidels.

After his victory in the Battle of Lechfeld (955), it became clear to everyone that the German king was the defender of Christianity. This was recognized also by Rome. When in 962 John XII crowned Otto emperor, the merits of the latter in the defence against the pagans proved to be an argument used by the pope to justify his decision. Significantly, almost the day after the battle, the monarch asked the Holy See for the first time to establish the Magdeburg province, citing the missionary work facing him. The connection between the triumph over the Hungarians and the foundation of the new church province was undoubtedly manifold. For example, Otto wanted to pay homage to St. Maurice, whose spear was the tool of victory and who was to be the patron of the planned province. However, in his correspondence with the Holy See, the king stressed evangelizing needs and this argument has to be taken very seriously. We can guess that, influenced by the victory at Lechfeld, the German monarch even more strongly identified himself with the role of emperor and, consequently, with the role of Christianizer.[108]

Otto I's imperial coronation took place on 2 February 962 on the Feast of the Purification of the Virgin. It was common in the Middle Ages for ceremonies inaugurating the reign of a king or emperor to be held on significant church holidays. The organizers wanted not only to provide additional splendour for the enthronement ceremonies, but also to stress the supernatural nature of the monarch's power. The Feast of the Purification of the Virgin has always been more of the feast of Christ than that of his Mother. On this day the Church reveals the Divine Infant as *Lumen ad revelationem gentium* (Lk 2:32). This is how he was described by Simeon, whose words are cited by the pericope chosen for the day. This can be interpreted as follows. Otto I saw his imperial coronation as an act that would make him even more similar to the Son of God. The third quarter of the 10th century was a period in which the monarch as a *typus Christi* was the subject of particularly intense reflections.[109] However, by choosing this particular feast, the monarch not only drew attention to the similarity itself, but also brought to the fore a specific property in which this similarity was manifested: the emperor, like the Eternally Begotten Son,

---

108   See Odilo Engels, "Mission und Friede an der Reichsgrenze im Hochmittelalter," in *Aus Kirche und Reich. Studien zu Theologie, Politik und Recht im Mittelalter. Festschrift für Friedrich Kempf*, ed. Hubert Mordek (Sigmaringen: Thorbecke, 1983), 208–210.

109   Roman Michałowski, "Otto III w obliczu ideowego wyzwania: monarcha jako wizerunek Chrystusa," in *Człowiek w społeczeństwie średniowiecznym* (Warsaw: Wydawnictwo DiG, 1997), 57–72.

was to carry the light of faith to the pagans.[110] The ruler was expressing his belief that the *missio ad gentes* was his special task.

As we can see, Otto I took his duties as a Christianizer very seriously. This can be seen both in the sphere of ideas and in the sphere of actions. His grandson had something to draw on. Nevertheless, Otto III must have experienced his evangelizing vocation more intensely, if he added apostolicity to the imperial intitulation. His grandfather did not go as far as that.

This intensity was manifested also in another event, which occurred during the Summit of Gniezno. Let us quote once again, this time in full, the most important fragment of Thietmar's description of the pilgrimage:

> Seeing the desired city from afar, he [Otto] humbly approached barefoot. After being received with veneration by Bishop Unger, he was led into the church where, weeping profusely, he was moved to ask the grace of Christ for himself through the intercession of Christ's martyr. Without delay, he established an archbishopric there, as I hope legitimately, but without the consent of the aforementioned bishop to whose diocese this whole region is subject. He committed the new foundation to Radim, the martyr's brother [. . .]. And with great solemnity, he also placed holy relics in an altar which had been established there.[111]

Among the Gniezno events there was one fact which has basically escaped the attention of scholars so far. It turns out that Otto III personally, with his own hands, placed the body of St. Adalbert in his final resting place.[112] The chronicler presents the matter succinctly, but there is no doubt that this is how we should understand the last sentence of the fragment quoted above. This is confirmed by other sources, which, when describing analogous events, provide many more details. Let as examine several examples.

---

110   Hehl, "Kaisertum, Rom und Papstbezug," 226–228.

111   "Videns a longe urbem desideratam nudis pedibus suppliciter advenit et ab episcopo eiusdem Ungero venerabiliter susceptus aecclesiam introducitur, et ad Christi gratiam sibi inpetrandam martyris Christi intercessio profusis lacrimis invitatur. Nec mora, fecit ibi archiepiscopatum, ut spero legitime, sine consensu tamen prefati presulis, cuius diocesi omnis haec regio subiecta est, committens eundem predicti martyris fratri Radimo [. . .]; factoque ibi altari sanctas in eo honorifice condidit reliquias" (thietmar, lib. IV, cap. 45, 182–184). English translation by Warner, *Ottonian* Germany, 183–184.

112   As far as I know, only Trawkowski has noted this ("Pielgrzymka Ottona III," 123). However, he has failed to note that we are dealing here with a rather common rite.

In 838 Emperor Lothar brought St. Januarius' relics from Rome to Reichenau. We learn about this translation from an account by Walahfrid Strabo, who commemorated the event with a poem written especially for the occasion.[113] Two issues are worthy of note from our point of view. First, the poet expresses a conviction that the arrival of the martyr in his new resting place will bring greater honour (*honor*) for the emperor and all his people.[114] Secondly, the work contains an instructive description of the ceremony held in Reichenau in connection with the arrival of the relics. It is worth quoting here three verses (11, 12 and 18) from the description in question:

> "Purpuram, sceptrum, diadema, fasces,
> militum turmas, decus et paternum
> temnit [sc. imperator], ut Christi melius honorem
> comprobet in se.
> "Nam pedes multis medius catervis
> Vadit, et sacro scapulas feretro
> Ossa gesturus preciosa subdit
> Martyris almi.
> [...]

---

113 *Walahfridi Strabi Carmina*, ed. Ernst Dümmler, no. 77: "De sancto Ianuario martyre," MGH Poetae Latini, vol. 2 (Berlin: Weidmann, 1884), 415–416. See Konrad Beyerle, "Aus dem liturgischen Leben der Reichenau," in *Die Kultur der Abtei Reichenau. Erinnerungsschrift der zwölfhundertsten Wiederkehr des Gründungsjahres des Inselklosters 724–1924*, ed. Konrad Beyerle, vol. 1 (Munich: Münchner Drucke, 1925), 354–356; Peter Willmes, *Der Herrscher-"Adventus" im Kloster des Frühmittelalters*, Münstersche Mittelalterschriften 22 (Munich: w. Fink, 1976), especially 136–141; Ursula Swinarski, *Herrschen mit Heiligen. Kirchenbesuche, Pilgerfahrten und Heiligenverehrung früh- und hochmittelalterlicher Herrscher (ca. 500–1200)*, Geist und Werk der Zeiten 78 (Bern: Lang, 1991), 384–385.

114 "Urbe de magna numeri perennis
unus [sc. Ianuarius] advenit, iuvet ut beatum
Caesaris nostri populique proni
Semper honorem" (verse 7).
"Illius [sc. imperatoris] regnum spaciumque vitae,
coniugem, prolem, populum fidelem
semper oratu meritisque, martyr
alme, iuvato" (verse 19) (*Walahfridi Strabi Carmina*, no. 77, 416)—"One of the perennial number arrives from the great city to help the blessed honour of our Caesar and people always be extended." (verse 7). "Nourishing martyr, always aid with prayer and merit his [the emperor's] kingdom and the length of his life, his consort, offspring, and faithful people" (verse 19).

"Ergo gratanter capito [sc. Ianuarii] pieque
dona, quae magnus parat imperator,
iam subi sedes praeparatas
munere largo."[115]

The poet first states that Lothar discarded his purple, sceptre, crown and other attributes of power, that he sent away his armed escort and that he expressed his disdain for the glory and splendour gained by his ancestors. Then we learn that the monarch, walking barefoot, mingled with the crowd and took the saint's body in his arms to carry it to its new resting place. Walahfrid Strabo explains the reasons of this humility: Lothar wanted to strengthen in him this *honor* the source of which was the Lord. Thus in the emperor's case we are dealing with a form of kenosis, self-emptying, symbolically discarding all the signs of his splendour and glory in the hope that, as a result, Christ will surround him with his own glory. The matter should be interpreted as follows: by renouncing all signs of glory and power, the monarch wanted, in a way, to assure God that he placed all his trust not in himself but in God.[116]

An important place in this self-emptying is occupied by the rite of carrying the relics. By taking them on his shoulders, the emperor acted as if he were an ordinary man, one of those who were surrounding him at the time. It must be noted that the verse in which the author mentions the carrying of the relics begins with the conjunction "nam": this means that the verse in question provides details or an explanation of the content of the preceding verse. Thus, Lothar's kenosis occurs also, or perhaps mainly, through the fact that he carries the venerable remains as if he were a common man.

At the same time the emperor becomes a servant of the saint. The poet expresses this view, saying that the emperor decided to put his neck under the bier on which the reliquary was carried. If we understand well, Walahfrid Strabo uses here the ambiguity of the verb *subdo*, which, in addition to "put under" also means "to become subordinated", "to submit". In other words,

---

115   Ibid. ("He scorned the purple, the sceptre, the diadem and fasces, the squadrons of troops and the paternal ornament, so that the honour of Christ could be better shown in himself. For he goes on foot in a great throng and lays his shoulders under the sacred bier, about to carry the precious bones of the nourishing martyr." […] "Therefore joyously take up the gifts which the great emperor provides, proceed to the seats prepared with abundant generosity").

116   Cf. Andrzej Pleszczyński, "Sobiesław I Rex Ninivitarum. Książę czeski w walce z ordynariuszem praskim Meinhardem, biskupem Rzeszy," in *Monarchia w średniowieczu*, 125–138, especially 127–132, with an analysis of a ruler's kenosis, which, however, was an act that belonged to a completely different rite.

by carrying the venerable remains, the monarch yielded his sovereignty to Januarius and in this way, among others, accomplished his kenosis. Of course, the saint is only a representative of Christ, which is why by serving the martyr, Lothar will obtain the Saviour's grace. As we remember, in the seventh verse the author says directly that Januarius came to Reichenau in order to support the ruler and his people in maintaining their splendour and glory.

Another highly enlightening work is *The Miracles of St. Germanus*.[117] It was written by Hericus, a monk from Saint-Germain in Auxerre, living contemporaneously with the translation in question.[118] A magnificent crypt was built in the Saint-Germain church, an act about which I shall write more in the next subchapter. The idea was to show an even greater veneration to St. Germanus, who had been lying in the church for several hundred years, that is, from the day of his funeral. The crypt was founded by Charles the Bald's aunt and uncle, Conrad the Elder and his wife Adelaide.

The translation took place in a specific political context. Louis the German invaded Charles the Bald's kingdom, disregarding an oath he had once sworn before the Franks.[119] The younger brother, betrayed by his own men, was unable to oppose the invasion by force of arms. With no hope of earthly succour, he turned to heavens for it. Inspired by God, he set off for Auxerre, for the Abbey of Saint-Germain, and when he arrived there, he decided to bring about the translation of the saint's body as soon as possible. He was not sure whether he would ever be able to return there. In addition, he believed that he would gain power and might, if he made the translation happen. He knew that this would be an act of great piety with regard to the saint.[120]

---

117   *Miracula sancti Germani episcopi Antissiodorensis auctore Herico monacho*, PL, vol. 124, cols. 1207–1270. I write about it in greater detail in point 4 of the present chapter.

118   For more on this, see Edina Bozóki, "L'Initiative et la participation du pouvoir laïc dans les translations de reliques au haut Moyen Age. Esquisse typologique," *Sources travaux historiques* 51–52 (1997 [printed: 2000]): 49–50. See also *Saint-Germain d'Auxerre. Intellectuels et artistes dans l'Europe Carolingienne. IXᵉ–XIᵉ siècles* (Auxerre: Musée d'art et d'histoire, 1990), 97–110 (articles by Dominique Iogna-Prat, Jean-Charles Picard and Christian Sapin).

119   *Miracula sancti Germani*, lib. II, nos. 99–100, col. 1254.

120   "Igitur loci ac temporis oportunitate captata, sacri translationem corporis absque dilatione perficiendam decrevit: quod et suae reversionis incertus existeret, et conceptae in sanctum devotionis officiis plurimum sibi roboris adquiri posse, non dubitaret" (ibid., no. 101, col. 1254)—"Therefore, having seized the opportunity of time and place, he commanded that the translation of the holy body should be accomplished without any delay, both since he was uncertain regarding his return, and since he did not doubt that he could obtain through the saint great strength for the services of devotion that he had conceived."

On the Feast of Epiphany 860[121] the king approached Germanus' tomb, sur-
rounded by a small number of bishops.[122] He did not allow others to come
closer. They sang hymns and psalms, remaining quite far from the tomb.
Charles opened it with the greatest reverence and paid homage to the holy
remains. God only knows how much piety the monarch displayed at the time,
but how dear this was to the Lord was demonstrated by events that soon
followed. In the meantime, the ruler wrapped the relics in precious fabrics,
taking advantage of the fact that the bishops—and he only allowed the bish-
ops to do so—supported the venerable remains. Next, through St. Germanus,
he offered God the incense of his faith, the balm and the scent, and then put
the body, carried with great pomp and circumstance, in the place where it still
lies, and gave the abbey some truly royal gifts. Soon after that, trusting in God's
power and the intercession of the saint, he set out on an expedition against his
enemies and, protected by heavens, he chased the enemies away, managing to
do so without bloodshed.[123] Thanks to God's grace and St. Germanus' support,
Charles the Bald regained power and ruled happily from that moment on.

Hericus's account tells us that during the translation the king—mainly the
king—was in physical contact with the relics. We know for sure that the mon-
arch opened the tomb, that he wrapped the venerable body in precious fabrics
and that he put the body in its new resting place. On the other hand, Charles
made sure that others had as little contact with the body as possible. Only
when he was wrapping the body, he allowed—"suffered" as the hagiographer
says—the bishops to touch it. We could say that he had no choice, because
somebody had to support the relics. We also learn from the analyzed work why
the monarch brought about the translation and what its effects were. The ruler
wanted to obtain heavenly help in his fight against Louis and he was not disap-
pointed: the enemy was vanquished and Charles regained his throne. The line

---

121   Hericus gives Epiphany 859 as the date. However, given the fact that this author quite
       freely used the March style, in which the year began on 1 March, we must move the date
       in question to 6 Janurary 860. See Madeleine Hardy and André Labbé, "En marge du con-
       flit entre Charles le Chauve et Girart de Vienne. Loup de Ferrières, Remi d'Auxerre et le
       peintre Fredilo," in *La Chanson de geste et le mythe carolingien. Mélanges René Louis*, vol. 1
       (Saint-Père-sous-Vézelay: Musée archéologique régional, 1982), 167, fn. 25.

122   *Miracula sancti German*, lib. II, 101, cols. 1254–1255. The events associated with the transla-
       tion are commented on by Joachim Wollasch, "Das Patrimonium Beati Germani in Auxerre.
       Ein Beitrag zur Frage der bayrisch-westfränkischen Beziehungen in der Karolingerzeit,"
       in *Studien und Vorarbeiten zur Geschichte des grossfränkischen und frühdeutschen Adels*,
       ed. Gerd Tellenbach, Forschungen zur oberrheinischen Landesgeschichte 4 (Freiburg im
       Breisgau: E. Albert, 1957), 191–192.

123   *Miracula sancti German*, lib. II, no. 102, col. 1255.

of thinking is simple here: the translation of the relics was an act of great piety on the part of the king. But what is particularly striking is the significance for this act of devotion of the monarch's personal participation in the translation of the remains. The ruler did not limit himself to giving orders to put the saint's body in a more worthy place, he was not satisfied with his mere presence during the ceremony; he took the body out of the old tomb with his own hands, wrapped it and put it in its new resting place.

Charles the Bald is associated with another translation worth noting in the context of the present reflection. This was the translation of the relics of St. Cornelius, pope and martyr, from Rome to Compiègne. The monarch wanted to transform Compiègne into his capital, following the example of Aachen. The way to achieve this was to found a palace chapel modelled on the chapel in Aachen.[124] Some role was played in this enterprise by the translation in question.

There are two extant descriptions of this translation. One is a poetic work contemporaneous with the event.[125] The author emphasizes the fact that the arrival of the venerable remains in Compiègne obtained heavenly grace and, consequently, all kinds of prosperity for Francia. The poet says—and he does so very emphatically several times—that at that point St. Cornelius became the patron of Francia, which he has been effectively supporting ever since with his power.[126] Another striking element is a description of the events associated with the welcoming of the relics to the chapel in the imperial palace. The poet does his best to emphasize the grandeur and splendour of the ceremonies.

---

124 Michałowski, *Princeps fundator*, 82 f. and older literature on the subject there; see also Michael Herren, "Eriugena's 'Aulae Siderae', the 'Codex Aureus' and the Palatine Church of St. Mary at Compiègne," *Studi Medievali* 28 (1987), 3rd series: 593–608; Nikolaus Staubach, *Rex christianus. Hofkultur und Herrschaftspropaganda im Reich Karls des Kahlen. Teil II: Die Grundlegung der 'religion royale'* (Cologne, Weimar and Vienna: Böhlau, 1993), 270–281; William J. Diebold, "Nos quoque morem illius imitari cupientes. Charles the Bald's Evocation and Imitation of Charlemagne," *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte* 75 (1993): 271–300, especially 279–282; Dominique Iogna-Prat, "Le Culte de la Vierge sous le règne de Charles le Chauve", in *Marie. Le culte de la Vierge dans la société médiévale*, ed. Dominique Iogna-Prat, Eric Palazzo, and Daniel Russo (Paris: Beauchesne, 1996), 65–98, especially 66–69.

125 *S. Cornelii Compendiensis Translationes, I*, ed. Paul de Winterfeld, MGH Poetae latini, vol. 4, 1 (Berlin: Weidmann, 1899), 237–239. It was included in a larger prose work written in the early 10th century and dedicated to the same translation of St. Cornelius (*Historia translationis corporis S. Cornelii papae apud Compendium*, PL, vol. 129, cols. 1371–1382). The larger version does not add new elements to the issues discussed here.

126 *S. Cornelii Compendiensis Translationes*, verses 9, 13, 16, 238.

On the other hand, he points to the piety of the participants. He says that they walked barefoot, that the bishops and the emperor carried the venerable body on their shoulders and, finally, that the faithful gathered round in great numbers to touch the bier on which the body was lying.[127] In addition, he stresses that many magnificent gifts awaited the saint in Compiègne. Charles the Bald gave Cornelius gold (perhaps—the text is not entirely clear—it was an altar made of gold),[128] silver, precious stones and valuable robes. But that was not all. The monarch doubled the number of clerics serving God in the chapel.

The work ends with the following verse, which may be an interpolation:[129]

> Conglobati atque tuo [sc. Cornelii] translatori Karolo
> Summae formam deitatis mereamur cernere,
> Quae disponens regit cuncta seculorum secula.[130]

Charles the Bald is referred to here as the "translator", that is, the man who brought the relics to the Frankish kingdom. At the same time the author expresses his hope for eternal salvation, assuming that he and everyone on whose behalf he speaks, "gathered" round the emperor. We do not really know whom the poet means: the monarch's subjects, the clerics serving God in the palace chapel or, rather, the participants in the celebrations he describes? However, irrespective of which answer is the correct one, one thing is beyond doubt: by translating the venerable remains, the ruler rendered such great service to St. Cornelius, that the latter was willing to ensure eternal salvation not only for him, but also for his people.

This was not only because Charles the Bald obtained the relics and translated them, not only because he gave magnificent gifts to the saint, but also because of the way he welcomed the remains. What must have mattered as well was the fact that the emperor personally carried the saint's body on his own shoulders.

---

127   "Colla tunc episcoporum atque regis incliti
      Dulce pondus deferebant aedis ad sacrarium,
      Plebsque supplex confluebat fulchra gaudens tangere [...]" (ibid., verse 7, 237)—
      "Then the necks of the bishops and the illustrious king carried the sweet burden to the chapel of the sanctuary, and the humble people flocked together, rejoicing to touch the posts [of the saint's bier."

128   Ibid., verse 16, 238.

129   This is the view of the editor, 239, footnote to verse 31.

130   *S. Cornelii Compendiensis Translationes, I*, verse 31, 239 ("Pressed together with your [i.e. of Cornelius] translator, Charles, let us be worthy of discerning the highest form of the deity that sets in order and rules all the world").

The rite is also confirmed for a later period, close to the reign of Otto III. Let us refer to two examples. Both concern translations carried out by the King of France, Robert II the Pious. The translations took place a quarter of a century after the emperor's death, but Robert himself, born around 970, was of the same generation as Otto.

Particularly interesting information can be found in a life of the ruler—which is not without hagiographic elements—written by Helgald of Fleury soon after the king's death.[131] The author begins by saying that the king greatly venerated St. Anianus, regarding him as his special patron. At that time the saint's resting place was at the Church of St. Peter in Orleans (commonly known as the Saint-Aignan Church). In order to venerate his patron even more, the monarch decided to move his body to a more worthy place and to this end he erected the church in question anew.[132] When the construction works were completed, in 1029 the monarch ordered church dignitaries to gather in Orleans, and the remains of St. Anianus as well as relics of other saints were elevated and placed temporarily in the Church of St. Martin. When everything was ready for the dedication ceremony, the king and the rejoicing populace took the patron's body on their shoulders, carried it to the newly built church and put it in its new resting place.[133] After the consecration of the church, the monarch—father of his homeland, as the hagiographer calls him—went before the altar of St. Peter and St. Anianus, took off his purple robe and, kneeling on both knees, prayed to God through the intercession of the saints whose translation had taken place that day. He asked the Lord to take away the sins of the living and to grant eternal peace to the dead; also to protect and guide the

---

131   Helgauld de Fleury, *Epitoma Vitae regis Rotberti pii*, ed. Robert Henri Bautier and Gillette Labory, Sources d'histoire médiévale 1 (Paris: Éditions du Centre national de la recherche scientifique, 1965); the fragment in question—cap. 22, 106–114.

132   It was an impressive building with a huge transept, 48 metres long and 17 metres wide; see John Ottaway, "Collégiale Saint-Aignan", in *Le Paysage monumental de la France autour de l'an Mil*, ed. Xavier Barral i Altet (Paris: Picard, 1987), 257–259.

133   "Sumitur [sc. corpus s. Aniani] itaque humeris incliti regis, gaudentium simul et letancium populorum et transfertur cum laudibus in templum novum quod ipse rex Rotbertus ędificaverat […] et eum in loco collocant sancto ad honorem, gloriam et laudem Jhesu Christi domini nostri et famuli sui Aniani, speciali gloria decorati" (ibid., 110).—"Thus [the body of Saint Anianus] was raised on the shoulders of the glorious king and the rejoicing and cheering people and carried with praise to the new temple which that same king Rodbertus himself had built […] and they placed him in a holy place in honour, praise, and glory of Jesus Christ our Lord and his servant Anianus, decorated with special glory."

kingdom entrusted to him, Robert, the kingdom that had been freed from its enemy by the power of the father of his homeland, St. Anianus.

It is worth noting that in two fragments of the analyzed chapter Helgald writes about rich gifts given by the monarch to the church or bequeathed by him. Among them Helgald lists a golden altar card for the main altar, a complete altar partly made of gold and silver, and three crosses made of pure gold; the largest of them weighed seven pounds. He also mentions that on that same occasion the monarch ordered St. Anianus' reliquary to be decorated with precious metals and stones.

Let us summarize the facts: Robert II translates the patron saint in order to obtain God's grace for the living and the dead as well as for his entire kingdom. By saying a prayer of intercession, he acts, in a way, as the main liturgist. At the same time, by taking off his purple robe, he performs an act of kenosis of sorts. On the other hand, we know—the biographer writes about it clearly—that the monarch personally carried the relics, although he was supported in this by his people.

Of lesser significance, from a religious point of view, was another translation involving Robert II. This was the elevation of the relics of St. Savinian, kept at the Abbey of St. Peter in Sens (Saint-Pierre-le-Vif). We owe a description of the event to Odorannus, a monk from the abbey and participant in the celebrations, who included an account of them in his Chronicle.[134]

When one day—writes the chronicler—Robert II went to Rome, he was followed by Bertha, his former wife, who had been dismissed because of a canonical impediment. She hoped that in Rome she would obtain permission to be reunited with her husband. The news of this plan reached Queen Constance, who became obviously worried. One night, as she was troubled by this, a venerable looking old man with a crosier in his hand appeared to her and reassured her that the danger was no longer there. As it turned out, the old man was St. Savinian, a martyr and the first Archbishop of Sens. Indeed, Robert soon returned home and not only did he not repudiate Constance but he loved her even more than before.

Grateful to Savinian, the queen decided to adorn his body with precious metals and stones, for it had been lying in a lead reliquary, buried in the ground. Constance's idea was wholeheartedly supported by the king, who commissioned a new reliquary to be made for the Saint-Pierre-le-Vif abbey, sparing

---

134   Odorannus de Sens, *Opera omnia*, ed. Robert-Henri Bautier and Monique Gilles, *Sources d'histoire médiévale* 4 (Paris: Editions du Centre national de la recherche scientifique, 1972), cap. 2, 100–110, especially 108–110. The author and his oeuvre are discussed in great detail by the editors, 7–69.

no gold, silver and precious stones for the purpose. God himself supported the enterprise, too: one day a lump of gold donated by the ruler was miraculously magnified.

When everything was ready, the monarch ordered the relics to be translated. On Friday, two days before the event, Archbishop Leoteric (Liéri) took the saint's body out of the lead reliquary and put it into the new one made of gold; on Sunday—we know from elsewhere that this was on 25 August 1028—the monarch and his son Robert carried the venerable remains on their own shoulders to their new resting place.[135] The author does not fail to mention that the event was accompanied by a miracle: a blind man regained his sight thanks to Savinian the martyr.

The reliquary commissioned by the royal couple (incidentally, made personally by the author of the Chronicle, Odorannus) has not survived; it was destroyed during the French Revolution. However, thanks to a 17th-century description, we can reconstruct its appearance. In comparison with reliquaries produced at the time, it was quite large; among the jewels decorating it, two cameos stood out: one with an image of Robert, the other with that of Constance. On its walls there was an inscription expressing the founders' gratitude to Savinian.[136]

The act of carrying the venerable remains by the ruler was an expression of the royal family's gratitude to the holy bishop for saving them from tragedy. Significantly, this time the king was assisted not by his people, as it was the case with the translation of St. Anianus, but by another member of the ruling family—Robert, son of Robert the Pious and Constance. This difference can be easily explained. During the translation of St. Anianus, what was at stake was the prosperity of the entire nation, while here we are dealing with an act of gratitude of the royal family.

It would not be difficult to multiply the number of the examples (I shall return to this in a moment), but the ones that have just been presented are enough for us to be able to say that by personally carrying the relics and putting

---

135   "Adveniente igitur die dominica, adest rex cum suis episcopis et proceribus, abbatibus quoque et clericis necnon et populo innumerabili ad transvehendum corpus martiris. Quem suscipiens una cum filio suo Rotberto propriis scapulis, reposuit cum manibus suis illo ubi in presenti veneratur a fidelibus populis" (ibid., 108–110).—"As Sunday approaches, the king is preset with his bishops and nobles, abbots and many clerics and a great many people, to carry across the body of the martyr. Lifting it up together with his son Rotbert on his own shoulders, he placed it with his hands in that place where it is at present venerated by the faithful people."

136   See information provided by the editors, 16–25.

them in their new resting place, the monarch was performing a specific rite.[137] What was its meaning?

Among the examples discussed here, the most instructive in this respect are the translation of St. Januarius and the translation of St. Germanus. Walahfrid Strabo was inclined to believe that Lothar, by carrying the relics on his shoulders, became a servant of the saint.[138] On the other hand, he strongly stressed the emperor's humility, self-emptying, kenosis. Of course, the very fact that such a great monarch was becoming a servant was a manifestation of humility, but there were other elements as well, such as taking off the insignia of power and mingling with common people. This kenosis allowed the monarch to experience Christ's power more effectively. As we can see, carrying the holy remains personally was a way for the ruler to obtain heavenly grace. Hericus of Auxerre thought along similar lines, though he focused on different elements. He said openly that Charles the Bald's participation in the translation was an act of great piety, which in turn paved the way for the king's military victory. It would be difficult to deny that this piety was expressed in a special way in personal service to the relics: carrying them and wrapping them in robes. Let us not forget how terrified Charles was at the thought of other participants in the ceremony, including bishops, touching the body. He must have been afraid that heavens might not attribute the entire merit to him. Thus, in Hericus's opinion, too, the rite I have been examining was a way to win favour with heavens, though this author did not stress the significance of kenosis so much.

Bringing relics from another country or even transferring them to a more worthy place within the same shrine was a way to obtain God's grace both for the kingdom to which they were brought or in which they were kept, and for the ruler, especially if he had contributed to the translation. This conviction can be found in many medieval works. However, as the examples quoted here show, when the king personally carried the remains, the blessing of heavens became more certain. That is why it was easier to believe that the trans-

---

137   The problem is examined by Jürgen Petersohn, "Saint Denis—Westminster—Aachen. Die Karlstranslation von 1165 und ihre Vorbilder," *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters* 31 (1975): 420–454; idem, "Kaisertum und Kultakt in der Stauferzeit," in *Politik und Heiligenverehrung*, 101–146. It is also worth referring to studies by Antonio Vuolo, who in his analysis of the hagiographic material concerning Arechis II of Benevento points to the prince's personal participation in the elevation and translation of relics. He claims that in this way the ruler wanted to emphasize priestly qualities of his monarchic office (Vuolo, "Agiografia beneventana," 216–217). Interesting material is provided by Bozóki, "L'Initiative," 39–58, but this author does not notice the rite in question and does not problematize the matter.

138   Petersohn, "Kaisertum und Kultakt," 119.

lated saint would become a patron of the kingdom and would more effectively obtain favour for the king and for the nation.

Let us now return to the events at Gniezno. In the light of the sources just discussed it becomes obvious that Thietmar's information that Otto III placed the holy remains in the altar is neither a mental shortcut nor a metaphor. The monarch really took the coffin in his arms and put it into the confessio.[139] There is no doubt either that this action was in accordance with quite commonly accepted models. The emperor was not driven by a reflex, sudden surge of piety or love for his dead friend; on the contrary, he performed an act that was a ritual.

The deposition itself was accompanied by other actions and behaviour, which usually took place on such occasions. The description included in the *Chronicle* tells us, for example, that in Gniezno the monarch, breaking down in tears, asked the martyr to obtain Christ's grace for him. We remember how important in the above mentioned examples the ruler's prayer was. Thanks to Thietmar we also know that Otto accomplished the last stage of the pilgrimage to Poland's capital walking barefoot. Therefore, we are allowed to infer that he was barefoot also when he placed the body of St. Adalbert in the altar, although the Bishop of Merseburg does not say so. Thus, we would be dealing here with an act of self-emptying, well-known from the descriptions analyzed earlier. We should also conclude that the monarch founded a magnificent golden altar in which the martyr's mortal remains found a new resting place.[140] I have noted

---

139   Piotr Bogdanowicz believes—wrongly—otherwise, "Zjazd gnieźnieński w roku 1000," *Nasza Przeszłość* 16 (1962): 60.

140   This was a view held already by Marian Sokołowski (see his article, published posthumously, "Ołtarz główny katedry gnieźnieńskiej," *Folia Historiae Artium* 1 (1964): 12) and probably the entire literature on the subject after him; more recently, such a view was also expressed by Tomasz Janiak, "Uwagi na temat ottońskiej konfesji św. Wojciecha w katedrze gnieźnieńskiej w świetle źródeł historycznych i archeologicznych," in *Trakt cesarski* 354. However, I cannot help thinking that this extraordinary unanimity in early medieval scholarship results from a misunderstanding of the relevant fragment of Thietmar's *Chronicle*—a misunderstanding the victims of which included Marian Zygmunt Jedlicki, the translator of the work into Polish. Jedlicki's translation reads as follows: "Również ufundował [tzn. cesarz] tam ołtarz i złożył na nim [*recte*: w nim] uroczyście święte relikwie"—"He [i.e. the emperor] established there an altar and placed the holy relics on it [*recte*: in it] with great solemnity" (*Kronika Thietmara*, edited and translated into Polish by Marian Zygmunt Jedlicki (Poznań: Instytut Zachodni, 1953), 208). Warner's English translation: "And with great solemnity, he also placed holy relics in an altar which had been established there." (*Ottonian Germany*, 184). The chronicler, however, writes: "factoque ibi altari sanctas in eo honorifice condidit reliquias". The expression "factoque altari" does not imply who built the altar or who founded it. The expression means more

several times that a ruler personally interring a saint's remains offered that saint precious gifts, often altar antependia.

The facts in question—namely the ritual of personally carrying the relics, prayer made credible by tears,[141] kenosis and magnificent gifts worthy of an emperor—set the scene for a great cultural act, an act by means of which the monarch expressed his deep veneration for the martyr, and through which he sought to obtain God's grace.

The ritual in question was performed by many rulers. Without trying to provide a complete list, I will mention Pepin the Short, Lothar I, Charles the Bald, Robert the Pious, Bretislaus of Bohemia (translation of St. Adalbert from Gniezno to Prague), Emperor Henry III, Louis VII of France, Frederick Barbarossa, Henry II of England and Saint Louis.[142] The list should be expanded to include Henry II of Germany, though in this case the fact that is of interest to us is not confirmed beyond any doubt.[143] On the other hand, the first two Ottos

---

or less: "After the altar had been built". If I am inclined to regard Otto as the founder, I do so on the basis of a different, indirect premise. Thietmar's account tells us that the altar was built only after the monarch had arrived in Gniezno, so the various elements of it, including the magnificent golden cards mentioned by Cosmas, must have been brought by the emperor. Another conclusion emerges as a result: that the cards and possibly some other parts of the altar were founded by the German ruler. Obviously, this is only a hypothetical conclusion. For more on the doubts surrounding Jedlicki's translation of the sentence in question, see Zygmunt Świechowski, "Ottońska konfesja katedry gnieźnieńskiej," *Studia Źródłoznawcze* 14 (1969): 5, fn. 28. For more on the altar in question, see also Piotr Skubiszewski, "Katedra w Polsce około roku 1000," in *Polska na przełomie I i II tysiąclecia*, 150 and footnote 94 on 178, which lists the literature on the subject, and Janiak, "Uwagi na temat ottońskiej," 349–381.

141   For more on Otton III's gift of tears, see Althoff, *Otto III.*, 81–82, 194; Stephan Waldhoff, "Der Kaiser in der Krise? Zum Verständnis von Thietmar IV 48," *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters* 54 (1998): 32–34.

142   Petersohn, "Kaisertum und Kultakt," 108–112.

143   I mean here the translation of St. Maurice's remains. In order to make up for the restitution of the Archbishopric of Merseburg, Henry II gave the Archbishopric of Magdeburg some land as well as a piece of St. Maurice's relics, This is a fact confirmed by sources of irreproachable value, contemporaneous with the events they describe. A 12th-century source tells us that the ruler carried the relic in his own hands, walking barefoot through ice and snow, from the Monastery of St. John, where it had been kept, to the city's cathedral—*Gesta archiepiscoporum Magdeburgensium*, ed. Wilhelm Schum, MGH SS, vol. 14 (Hanover: Hahn, 1883), 393. The problem is that this author wrote from the perspective of over one-hundred years and, well-informed as he was—he may have even used a written source—we cannot be entirely sure that some details are not his own amplifications. For more on the translation in question, see Swinarski, *Herrschen*, 281–290; David

are not present among well-known examples. This may be due to a lack of source documents. However, the most likely explanation is that we are dealing with differences between the religiosity of Otto III and that of his father and grandfather. It seems that Otto III felt a more profound need to obtain support from saints. This corresponds to the information given earlier that the young emperor was filled with great joy when he learned of the death of St. Adalbert, as well as to Bruno's belief that human beings were not capable of doing anything good by themselves, if they were not supported by the merits of martyrs. Bruno and Otto differed to some extent when it came to their political views, but in their spirituality they were very close.

Are we able to say what specific hopes Otto III had for the homage paid in Gniezno to the martyr, especially for the ritual of personally placing the saint's body in an altar? Analogous cases enable us to draw only a general conclusion that the emperor must have wanted to ensure prosperity for himself, for the Empire and for the nations ruled by him. We are taken a step further with the information provided by Gallus Anonymus that Otto III went to Gniezno not only *orationis* but also *reconciliationis gratia*.[144] This is highly probable, especially if we take into account the spirit of penance in which the emperor lived. On the other hand, when it comes to the reason why the monarch felt a need for reconciliation, there are no grounds to look for it in a sense of guilt allegedly troubling the ruler on account of his attitude to Adalbert, when he had still been alive, and to the entire Slavnik family.[145] We know nothing about such remorse; the sources are completely silent on the matter. It is true that we cannot point to any other action by Otto III regarded by the emperor as

---

A. Warner, "Henry II at Magdeburg: kingship, ritual and the cult of saints," *Early Medieval Europe* 3 (1994), n: 2: 135–166.

144   Gall, lib. I, cap. 6, 18.

145   This is a view expressed by Trawkowski, "Pielgrzymka Ottona," passim, especially 123. This scholar once argued that the emperor had been plagued by remorse caused by his attitude during the 996 synod in Rome. He did not stand up for Adalbert, when the Metropolitan of Mainz, Willigis, demanded that the bishop return to his diocese. As a result, the saint was forced to go to Prussia, where he lost his life. There was also another reason for the monarch's spiritual unease: he had done nothing to save the Slavniks from Boleslav II and his thugs. This is how Trawkowski concludes his argument: "As Adalbert, now a martyred saint and part of the supernatural order, was about to become a personal patron of the emperor and the empire, a symbol of Ottonian ideology, the meaning of the events of 996 had to be erased. By personally placing the saint's body in an altar founded by himself, Otto wanted to establish a new sacred bond between himself as emperor and the martyr."

his great sin.[146] Yet the young monarch's spirituality was characterized exactly by that—he suffered not because of some concrete, great sin, but because of a general sense of sinfulness.[147]

However, it would be a mistake to say that Otto III's journey to Gniezno was primarily penitential. No source from the period mentions reconciliation as the only purpose of the journey; on the contrary, observers stressed the atmosphere of triumph accompanying the event.[148] The main objective of the pilgrimage was certainly to spread Christianity. This is clearly evidenced by the titles attributed to the emperor in that period as well as by the founding of a new church province, which was accomplished at the time. Thus, it seems that by performing the ritual of deposing the body himself, ritual combined with kenosis, the monarch wanted first of all to obtain God's blessing for evangelizing ventures. A deep meaning of this act is revealed in the often quoted opinion by Bruno of Querfurt, according to whom the success of a mission depended on the merits of saints martyred contemporaneously. In 1000 there was only one such saint: Adalbert Slavnik.

However, it seems that in the eyes of Otto III's the Bishop of Prague was more than a martyr. This can be found in *Vita I*.

When the Prussians demanded that St. Adalbert explain who he was, he replied as follows: "Sum natiuitate Sclauus, nomine Adalbertus, professione monachus, ordine quondam episcopus, officio nunc uester apostolus".[149] This is how the matter is reported by the author of *Vita I*; later sources had the martyr use different words. We are struck primarily by the fact that, according to the account, St. Adalbert referred to himself as an apostle. The hagiographer used a term that was highly charged ideologically. It is doubtful whether the saint indeed used this word. He was highly critical of himself and full of remorse, so it is difficult to believe that he ascribed such a high status to himself. Rather, we have to assume that the decision to use the term was made by the author of the account.

"Apostle" has been a basic term in ecclesiology from the very beginning of Christianity, and it was just as well-known and commonly used in the early Middle Ages. It was used to describe members of the College of the Twelve,

---

146   This is rightly pointed out by Trawkowski, "Pielgrzymka Ottona," passim.

147   See Chapter III, point 2.

148   Thietmar, lib. IV, cap. 44, 182: "Nullus imperator maiori umquam gloria a Roma egreditur neque revertitur" ("Indeed, no emperor ever exited from Rome or returned there with greater glory"—Warner, *Ottonian Germany*, 183).

149   *Adalberti Vita I*, cap. 28, 42 ("I am a Slav by birth by the name of Adalbert; by profession I am a monk, and was once ordained bishop. My office is now that of your apostle").

St. Paul and some other figures known from the New Testament, like Barnabas, Timothy or Epaphroditus. A very important component of the term was the notion of sending—an apostle was someone called to spread Christianity among people not knowing Christ or not regarding him as the Saviour.[150]

But Adalbert did not live when Christianity was beginning, but in the 10th century, so he could not be considered to be an apostle in the strictest sense of the word. The hagiographer realized that and, appropriately, made it clear that the saint was not an apostle in general, but an apostle of the people to whom he came. This brings to mind the words of St. Paul, who wrote in his letter to the Corinthians: "Etsi aliis non sum apostolus, sed tamen vobis sum" (1 Cor 9:2). In his letter to the Romans, on the other hand (11:13), he calls himself *apostolus gentium*, so not of all people but of the pagans.

Drawing on St. Paul's writings, medieval authors sometimes used a modified term of apostle. It was used to describe a man, especially a saint, who had contributed to the evangelization of a people or a country. In such a case it was no longer important when the man lived and worked. He did not have to be a direct disciple of Christ, associate of St. Peter or St. Paul, to deserve the title. In accordance with this convention, St. Gregory the Great was called Apostle of the English, St. Patrick—Apostle of Ireland, and Charlemagne—Apostle of the Saxons. The example from the *Life of St. Adalbert I* is part of this tradition.

Both notions described by the term "apostle" were closely linked; they shared a missionary vocation. Yet, since they were separate notions, a kind of tension emerged between them. Let us try to analyze this, taking the apostolicity of St. Martial as an example.[151]

According to information provided by Gregory of Tours, St. Martial the Confessor came to Gaul during the reign of Emperor Decius and became Bishop of Limoges.[152] The author of his *vita* written around 800.[153] monumentalized his biography: according to him, Martial lived not in the 3rd century but in

---

150 For more on the meaning of the terms *apostolus* and *apostolus gentium* in medieval sources, see first of all Hans Ulrich Rudolf, *Apostoli gentium. Studien zum Apostelepitheton unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des Winfried-Bonifatius und seiner Apostelbeinamen* (Diss. Tübingen, 1971); among more detailed literature, see Jürgen Petersohn, "Apostolus Pommeranorum. Studien zu Geschichte und Bedeutung des Apostelepithetons Bischof Ottos von Bamberg," *Historisches Jahrbuch* 86 (1966): 257–294.

151 For more on this, see Rudolf, *Apostoli gentium*, 61–62, 84, 92–98.

152 *Gregorii episcopi Turonensis Historiarum libri decem*, ed. Rudolf Buchner, vol. 1, Ausgewählte Quellen zur deutschen Geschichte des Mittelalters 2 (Berlin: Deutcher Verlag der Wissenschaften, 1967), lib. I, cap. 30, 36–38.

153 *Vita sancti Martialis antiquior* [BHL 5551].

the 1st, and was sent to Gaul by St. Peter, to whose companions he belonged.[154] When he came to Limoges, he carried the staff of the Prince of the Apostles. It enabled him to resurrect a companion who died during the journey.

Before the last quarter of the 10th century the cult of the Confessor was only local. He was venerated as the first bishop of the local Church in Limoges, primarily in the Saint-Martial monastery. A breakthrough came towards the end of that century, in a completely new political and cultural situation. This is not the place to provide a more detailed analysis of it; it will suffice to point to the peace movement which spread across southern France and to the policy pursued by Duke William the Great, who sought to impose his rule on Aquitaine. The saint gradually became a guarantor of peace working in heaven, and, at the same time, a patron of the ruler, who tried to establish this peace on earth.

In any case, in the 990s Martial's cult acquired a supraregional dimension and the saint's hagiographic legend became even more monumental,[155] The author of *Vita prolixior* written at the time[156] assures the readers that his protagonist, a relative of St. Peter and St. Stephen, was a disciple of Christ. He did not leave the Master even for a moment. He was the child given by the Lord to the Apostles as an example of humility, he was also the boy who had the loaf and the fish miraculously multiplied by the Saviour and given to the multitudes following him. Present during the Last Supper, he served Jesus washing the feet of the Apostles. After the Passion, he followed St. Peter to Antioch and Rome, and eventually, obeying a command given by Christ himself, reached Gaul, converting it to the true faith.

The cult was at its height in the 1020s and 1030s, when the monks of Saint-Martial repeatedly demanded that the Limoges Church officially recognize their patron as an apostle. Until then they had venerated him as a confessor. The monks even went as far as mentioning the saint's name in litanies not among confessors but among apostles, and celebrated masses in his honour using the *commune apostolorum*. In secular documents—namely in

---

154　The development of the cult of St. Martial between the 9th and the mid-11th centuries is examined succinctly by Cécile Treffort, "Le Comte de Poitiers, duc d'Aquitaine, et l'Eglise aux alentours de l'an mil (970–1030)," *Cahiers de Civilisation Médiévale* 43 (2000): 415–417. A good introduction to the hagiographic atmosphere of the period is provided by Szymon Wieczorek's study, *Twórczość hagiograficzna Letalda z Micy na tle hagiografii francuskiej schyłku X i początku XI wieku* (Warsaw, 2001) (typescript).

155　The cult of St. Martial in the late 10th century and the first half of the 11th century is to a large extent the subject of a book by Landes, *Relics, Apocalypse and the Deceits of History*.

156　BHL 5552.

diplomas—Martial's name began to be combined with the title of *apostolus*. These actions were actively supported by Ademar of Chabannes, who devoted all his energy and literary art to the cause,[157] citing as his argument some forgeries he himself had fabricated. The monks' efforts came up against resistance in some circles of the Aquitaine clergy, above all of the Bishop of Limoges and canons from the local cathedral chapter. Although it would have been a great splendour for the local Church to have a "real" Apostle as the founder, recognition of Martial's extraordinary titles would have considerably reinforced the position of the monks who cared for his body at the expense of the bishop and the cathedral clergy. However, in spite of this resistance, in 1031, during a diocesan synod, the Saint-Martial monks were finally successful in their endeavours.[158]

These discussions, polemics and controversies are of interest to us only insofar as they help us better understand the notion of apostolicity. Particularly valuable from this point of view are two works by Ademar of Chabannes. The first is a circular letter written by our protagonist in September 1029, intending to send it to some representatives of the Aquitaine clergy.[159] After the painful events of 3 August that year, when he had been publicly, fiercely and—it seems—effectively attacked by Benedict of Chiusa for supporting the cause of Martial's apostolicity, Ademar wanted to demonstrate that the accusations levelled by his adversary were groundless, heretic and godless. In the analyzed letter, the author abides by the thesis presented in *Vita prolixior* whereby the first Bishop of Limoges was a disciple of Christ *in carne*. In this way he defends not only Martial's right to the title of apostle, but also the view that this saint occupies a high position in the apostolic hierarchy. Though he was not a member of the College of the Twelve, he was soon called by Christ himself and, together with members of the College, he received the power of binding and releasing from him. He was not a disciple of St. Peter, but, together with Peter, a disciple of the Saviour. He went on a mission to Gaul, obeying an order of the Lord and not of the Bishop of Rome. This places him higher than those apostles who—like Timothy, Mark or Epaphroditus—were granted this honour after

---

157 Landes, *Relics, Apocalypse and the Deceits of History*, passim.

158 A concise account of the events is given by Dumas in Amman and Dumas, *L'Eglise au pouvoir des laïcs*, 184–185. A reconstruction of the facts depends largely on whether specific sources are regarded as authentic or not. Auguste Dumas accepted as authentic some works otherwise considered to be suspicious.

159 *Ademari epistola de Apostolatu sancti Martialis*, PL, vol. 141, cols. 87–112; see Landes, *Relics, Apocalypse and the Deceits of History*, 228–268.

the Ascension. *Naturalis apostolus, non novus, sed antiquissimus*—these are terms summarizing Ademar's views.[160]

He knew very well, however, that the thesis was fiercely attacked, that facts cited in its support were rejected, and that the texts he referred to were deemed unreliable (some believed them to be forgeries). During his dispute with Benedict of Chiusa he experienced all this very acutely. That is why he tried to defend Martial's apostolicity also in a less controversial manner. Even if—he says—the saint had not been a disciple of Christ *in carne*, he could still be regarded as an apostle, because he was the first man to convert Aquitaine.[161] Citing the authority of St. Jerome, he makes a distinction between two notions: *apostolus* and *apostolicus vir*. In terms of their meaning, the two terms are similar, because an apostle and an apostolic man are both missionaries. However, the apostle is the first to preach the word of God in a given province, while the apostolic man continues the work begun by someone else.[162] Ademar

---

160 "[…] Martialis ipse est naturalis apostolus, non, sicut canes oblatrantes dicunt, novus, sed antiquissimus atque per omnia a Christo post XII apostolos priores electus; sed non solus apostolus, sed etiam Chisti in carne discipulus, et beati Petri principis apostolorum condiscipulus. Majus est enim esse in carne discipulum Christi, quam apostolum post ascensionem Christi. Multos enim nemo peritus ignorat fuisse pseudoapostolos et veritatis apostolos post ascensionem Christi, qui nequaquam fuerunt tamen in carne discipuli Christi (*Ademari epistola*, col. 90 D–91 A)—"Martial himself is a natural apostle, not, as the barking dogs claim, a new one, but rather a most ancient apostle, elected by Christ after the first twelve apostles. But he is not only an apostle, but also a disciple of Christ in the flesh, and co-disciple of Saint Peter, leader of the apostles. For it is greater to be a disciple of Christ in the flesh than to be an apostle after Christ's Ascension. No knowledgable person is unaware that there have been pseudo-apostles and apostles of truth after the Ascension of Christ, who were nevertheless never disciples of Christ in the flesh."

161 "Sic et Martialis, si discipulus Christi in carne non esset—quod dicere impium est—eo quod tamen primus Aquitaniam convertit, recte potest praedicari apostolus" (ibid., col. 98 B)—"Thus Martial, even if he not a disciple of Christ in the flesh (and it is impious to say so), since nevertheless he first converted Aquitania, he can correctly be called an apostle."

162 "Inter apostolos vero et apostolicos viros Hieronimus hanc differentiam dicit quod apostoli sunt qui primi unamquamque provinciam praedicare coeperunt, unde et hodieque astruit apostolos posse fieri in Ecclesia, quorum signa et indicia apostolatus complentur; id est si hodieque vel in finem mundi aliqua provincia fuerit in qua nullus ante praedicator accesserit, qui primus ad eam aliquo modo accedens eam praedicare coeperit, et unam solummodo Ecclesiam fundaverit, recte apostolus est; qui vero post eum venerint praedicatores et episcopi, illi sunt apostolici viri (ibid., col. 98 CD)—"Between apostles and apostolic men Jerome said that there is this different: the apostles are those who first began to preach in every province, which is why he added also that even today there can be apostles in the church, whose signs and marks fulfil the apostleship. That is to say: if

mentions Titus as an example. He worked in Crete, which had earlier been evangelized by St. Paul.

Under such a terminological convention, a missionary did not have to live in Christ's times to be worthy of the title of apostle. Ademar states clearly that if a province still remains pagan before the end of the world, even then true apostles would be able to live and work. The author tries to make the term in question more precise. In order to have the right to the title, it is not even necessary to Christianize a country—shall we say—completely. It is enough for a missionary to establish one church in a province.

All these arguments were necessary to demonstrate that Martial did deserve his title, because he had been the first man to preach the Word of God in Gaul, because he had won over entire Aquitaine for Christ, because he had founded churches there and because he had been the first to institute bishops in cities. These were facts which even Benedict of Chiusa did not question.

Another source I will refer to in the context of this reflection is a forgery made by Ademar—an alleged bull of John XIX (JL 4092),[163] for a long time considered to be authentic.[164] It contains no less than a papal decree stating that Martial can be called an apostle and that he deserves the liturgy reserved for apostles. The document contains a biography of St. Martial in accordance with the version presented in *Vita prolixior*, including the overriding thesis that the saint was a disciple of Christ. But in justifying the decree, the alleged issuer emphasizes other arguments. Namely, he argues against the view that only a member of the College of the Twelve can be regarded as an apostle. After all, the title was used with regard to men elevated to this dignity by other apostles, such as Barnabas or Epaphroditus. On the other hand, Gregory the Great, commonly regarded as a confessor, is referred to by the English as an apostle. All this is fully justified, because the title in question is reserved for those who, sent by Divine revelation to preach the Gospel, free the people entrusted to them from Satan's power by the power of God. "Apostle"—adds

---

even today there should be at the ends of the world any province in which there had been no earlier preacher, the one who should in some manner go to that province and first begin to preach, and found a Church, is correctly to be called an apostle. Those, however, who should come after him as preachers and bishops, they are apostolic men."

163   *Papsturkunden*, vol. 2, no. †591, 1114–1117; the forgery is acknowledged by the editor. For more on the bull, see also Landes, *Relics, Apocalypse and the Deceits of History*, 274–275.

164   For instance by Dumas in Amman and Dumas, *L'Eglise au pouvoir des laïcs*, 184–185, fn. 4; also Klaus-Jürgen Herrmann, *Das Tuskulanerpapsttum (1012–1046). Benedikt VIII., Johannes XIX., Benedikt IX.*, Päpste und Papsttum 4 (Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann, 1973), 121–123, without even mentioning that there was a problem.

the pope—simply means "sent".[165] Martial fulfils this criterion. He went to Gaul sent there by Christ to preach the Good News and won over innumerable multitudes to the Lord.

In the letter Ademar points out that there are two kinds of apostles. They have an important characteristic in common, namely mission among the pagans, nevertheless this single term denotes two separate realities. In the first case, the power to bind and release, and being sent on a mission come from Christ himself working in the flesh here on earth. In the second case, the power of binding and releasing was bestowed and the sending on a mission was done by an apostle or his successor. Hence such terms as *naturalis apostolus* or *non novus, sed antiquissimus* [*apostolus*] used with reference to Martial.

The meaning of the bull is different. Its readers do not feel that they are dealing with two separate realities. In fact, there is only one notion of the apostle and if there is a difference between a member of the College of the Twelve and a missionary mandated by heavens to convert some people, it is very small—small enough for both to be accorded the same liturgy. In his efforts to erase this difference, the forger goes as far as regarding the membership in the College of the Twelve as being of little significance. After all, he says, what matters is the type of service and not the number.[166]

We know what Ademar wanted to achieve. He wanted Martial to be pronounced an apostle even at the cost of undermining the significance of the term. At the same time he made sure that the undermining was not too radical. After all, he wanted the saint to be venerated liturgically as an apostle. On the other hand, he left his options open to be able to provide a strong interpretation of the term, when an appropriate moment came. The pope in his bull did confirm with his authority that Martial had been a disciple of Christ *in carne*.

The balancing act of the Angoulême monk was possible, because the analyzed term, which had several connotations, was extremely flexible.

---

165   "Cum igitur apostoli nomen non sit numeri sed officii, quicumque revelante Deo ad praedicandum mittitur, et sua pia exhortatione et exemplo commissum sibi divinitus populum a potestate diaboli liberat, non incongrue apostolus dici potest, quia apostolus missus dicitur" (*Papsturkunden*, vol. 2, no. †591, 1116)—"Since therefore the title of apostle pertains not to the number but to the office, whosoever is sent to preach, by God's revelation, and by his pious exhortation and example frees by divine agency the people given to him from the power of the devil, it is not unsuitable for such a person to be called apostle, since someone who is sent is called apostle."

166   See the beginning of the sentence quoted in the previous footnote. It is difficult to believe that a pope could have written something like this.

A question does remain, however: did St. Adalbert, in the light of the material so far presented, fulfil the criteria of the broadest possible definition of apostolicity as it was understood in the early Middle Ages? True, he did go on a mission to a completely pagan country, where no one before him had preached the Gospel. On the other hand, the venture ended in failure. The missionary did not baptize anyone in that country, nor did he found a single church. *Vita I* does mention that he baptized multitudes, but this took place in Poland and not in Prussia. We also need to bear in mind that before the 11th century missionaries were very rarely described as apostles. In the early Middle Ages people hesitated to use this title even with reference to St. Boniface.[167]

Of course, the hagiographer may have resorted to using these terms expecting a future conversion of the Prussians. We know that Bruno of Querfurt ascribed the success of missions to the merits of martyrs, including St. Adalbert. Following this line of reasoning, one could expect that a real evangelization of the Prussians would soon take place and that it would happen thanks to the first missionary who had made the country fertile with his own blood. We cannot help but get the impression that the suggestion that the Bishop of Prague was an apostle was submitted too hastily. The best evidence of this is the fact that in his own version of St. Adalbert's biography Bruno did not repeat the term. He had the text of *Vita I* before him and used it extensively, but when he came across the word *apostolus*, he preferred to paraphrase it.[168] In his *Life of St. Adalbert*, Bruno of Querfurt put a lot of emphasis on his protagonist's missionary work, more so than the author of *Vita I*.[169] At one point

---

167   Rudolf, *Apostoli gentium*, 146–156.

168   *Adalberti Vita II*, cap. 25, 32: "De terra Polanorum quam Bolizlauus proximus christiano dominio procurat, ad uos pro uestra salute uenio; seruus illius qui fecit cęlum et terram, mare et cuncta animantia. Venio uos tollere a manu diaboli et faucibus dęmonis auerni, ut cognoscatis creatorem uestrum et deponatis sacrilegos ritus, abrenuntiantes mortiferas uias cum inmunditiis cunctis, et ut loti balneo salutis effficiamini christiani in Christo, habentes in ipso remissione, peccatorum et regnum immortalium cęlorum" ("I come to you for your salvation from the land of the Poles, which Bolesław administers for Christian lordship, as a servant of Him who made heaven and earth, the sea, and all living things. I come to take you from the hand of the devil and the jaws of the demonic inferno, so that you should recognise your creator and set aside sacrilegious rites, renounce the deathly ways and all uncleanliness, so that, as though washed in a bath of salvation, you should be made Christian in Christ. In him you should have the remission of sins and the kingdom of immortal heavens"). The long-winded sentence beginning with *venio* replaces the concise *uester apostolus* [*sum*] in the source.

169   Friedrich Lotter, "Das Bild des hl. Adalbert in der römischen und sächsischen Vita," in *Adalbert von Prag*, 106.

he even compared the Bishop of Prague to the Apostles Peter, Matthew and Paul.[170] And yet he regarded the term *apostolus* as inappropriate.

We know that *Vita I* was written within the sphere of influence of the imperial court and followed its ideológical premises. Otto III may have wanted to stress the apostolic nature of his patron. Taking advantage of the flexibility of the term in question, he was prepared to use it even more freely than it was customary at the time.

It seems we have found a key to understanding the intentions of the emperor as he took the body of St. Adalbert in his own hands placed it in the confessio. If for Otto III the Bishop of Prague was not only a martyr but also an apostle, the purpose of his cult—at least one of several purposes—was to obtain the grace of heavens for missionary enterprises. An important role in medieval piety was played by the conviction that the intercession of a saint was particularly effective in the place in which he continued the work begun on earth. Thus the monarch could hope that he who had been an apostle during his earthly life, would be of great help in heaven in the evangelization of the pagans and would support him—an apostle-emperor working here on earth.

4 St. Adalbert's Shrine on the Tiber Island

Is it not an exaggeration on my part that I write so emphatically about an apostolic interpretation of the figure of St. Adalbert? I am confirmed in my opinion by an analysis of the foundation the emperor established in Rome to honour the martyr.

This was not the monarch's only foundation dedicated to him. During the few years left until his death, Otto III managed to found several other churches dedicated to St. Adalbert: in Aachen, on the Reichenau, in Affile near Subiaco and in Ravenna.[171] Not only their number but also their locations testify to the

---

170   *Adalberti Vita II*, cap. 11, 11.

171   Pierre Touber, *Les Structures du Latium médiéval. Le Latium méridional et la Sabina du IXᵉ siècle à la fin du XIIᵉ siècle*, Bibliothèque des Ecoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome 221 (Rome: École Française de Rome, 1973), vol. 2, 1024, fn. 2; Helmut Maurer, "Rechtlicher Anspruch und geistliche Würde der Abtei Reichenau unter Kaiser Otto III.," in *Die Abtei Reichenau. Neue Beiträge zur Geschichte und Kultur des Inselklosters*, ed. H. Maurer, (Sigmaringen: Thorbecke, 1974), 269–270; Karl-Josef Benz, *Untersuchungen zur politischen Bedeutung der Kirchweihe unter Teilnahme der deutschen Herrscher im hohen Mittelalter*, Regensbuger Historische Forschungen 4 (Kallmünz/Opf.: M. Lassleben, 1975), 75–91; тeresa Dunin-Wąsowicz, "'Pereum' medioevale," *Felix Ravenna. Rivista di antichità Ravennati, christiani, bizantine* 116 (1978): 87–101; eadem, Le culte, 35–38; eadem,

importance the ruler attached to the cult of the martyr: Aachen was the most important capital of the Empire north of the Alps, while Ravenna—the second most important city on the Apennine Peninsula and a place where the emperor founded a monastery that was very close to his heart. He was also favourably disposed to the efforts of his friends who wanted to build a church and dedicate it to Adalbert. It will suffice to mention Bishop Notker's foundation in Liège. In addition, the monarch would provide his own churches and those of his friends with relics.[172] We know that during the Summit of Gniezno Bolesław Chrobry gave Otto St. Adalbert's arm and that this arm was brought to Rome.[173] It is in any case possible that the Polish ruler had sent the emperor some parts of the venerable body even before that.

Among all those ventures by means of which the emperor wanted to honour the Apostle of the Prussians a special role was to be played by the Roman shrine.

We know of the existence of the site in question on the Tiber Island from 11th-century papal bulls issued for the Bishop of Porto in whose domain the church found itself.[174] We learn from them that initially it bore the name of

"Wezwania św. Wojciecha w Europie Zachodniej," in *Święty Wojciech w polskiej tradycji historiograficznej*, 1st ed. 1982, ed. Gerard Labuda (Warsaw: Instytut Wydawniczy Pax, 1997), 372–370; Ludwig Falkenstein, *Otto III. und Aachen, MGH* Studien und Texte 22 (Hanover: Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 1998), 119–124.

172   For more on this, see Jadwiga Karwasińska, "Studia krytyczne nad żywotami św. Wojciecha, biskupa praskiego. Vita I," *Studia Źródłoznawcze* 2 (1958): 51–52.; Kazimierz Śmigiel, "Gnieźnieńskie relikwie św. Wojciecha," in *Ecclesia Posnanensis. Opuscula Mariano Banaszak Septuagenario dedicata* (Poznań: Uniwersytet im. Adama Mickiewicza w Poznaniu. Wydział Teologiczny, 1998), 39–45, especially 43; Elżbieta Dąbrowska, "Pierwotne miejsce pochowania i recepcja relikwii św. Wojciecha we wczesnym średniowieczu," in *Tropami świętego Wojciecha*, ed. Zofia Kurnatowska, Poznańskie Towarzystwo Przyjaciół Nauk. Wydział Historii i Nauk Społecznych. Prace Komisji Archeologicznej 18 (Poznań: Wydawnictwo Poznańskiego Towarzystwa Przyjaciół Nauk, 1999), 147–158; Teresa Dunin-Wąsowicz, "Ślady kultu świętego Wojciecha w Europie zachodniej około roku 1000," in ibid., 221–234.

173   Gall, lib. I, cap. 6, s. 19; *Cantica Medii Aevi*, verse 9a, 13; see also the material presented in the next subchapter.

174   Here is a selection of the most important publications dealing with the earliest history of the church on the Tiber Island and of the so-called wellhead of St. Adalbert, located at the entrance to the choir loft; both issues are so closely linked that a work dealing with one must also touch upon the other: Géza von Frankovich, "Contributo alla scultura ottoniana in Italia. Il puteale di S. Bartolomeo all'Isola in Roma," *Bollettino d'Arte. Ministero della Educazione Nazionale* 30, seria terza (1936), no. 5: 207–224; Otto Homburger, "Ein Denkmal ottonischer Plastik in Rom mit dem Bildnis Ottos III.," *Jahrbuch der*

St. Adalbert,[175] to which the dedication to St. Paulinus of Nola was added as early as in the 1020s.[176] In addition, a bull by Leo IX of 22 April 1049 tells us that the church founded by Otto III to honour St. Adalbert was already consecrated by the Bishop of Porto during the reign of the ruler.[177] It is highly likely that the construction of the church began even before the Summit of Gniezno, that is, in 999 or even in 998.[178] There is nothing unusual about that. The beginnings of St. Adalbert's Church in Aachen go back to 997[179] and the one in Affile—as far as 999.[180]

As we explore the most distant past of the church, architectural research can be only of limited use. So far it has not given an unequivocal answer as to

---

preussischen Kunstsammlungen 57 (1936): 130–140; Joseph Braun, "Brunneneinfassung in S. Bartolomeo all'Isola zu Rom," *Römische Quartalschrift für christliche Altertumskunde und für Kirchengeschichte* 45 (1937): 25–41; Géza von Frankovich, *Arte carolingia ed ottoniana in Lombardia, Römisches Jahrbuch für Kunstgeschichte* 6 (1942–1944): footnote 55 on 136–139; Carlo Cecchelli, *Studi e documenti sulla Roma sacra*, vol. 2, Società Romana di Storia Patria, 18 (Roma: Presso la Società alla Società Vallicelliana, 1951), 29–88; Victor Heinrich Elbern, "Zum Verständnis und zur Datierung der Aachener Elfenbeinsitula," in *Das erste Jahrtausend. Kultur und Kunst im werdenden Abendland an Rhein und Ruhr*, ed. V. H. Elbern, Textband 2 (Düsseldorf: Schwann, 1964), 1072–1077; Aleksander Gieysztor, "Rzymska studzienka ze św. Wojciechem z roku około 1000," 1st ed. 1966, in *Święty Wojciech w polskiej tradycji*, 337–346; Mieczysław Rokosz, "Inter duos pontes. O ottońskiej fundacji ku czci św. Wojciecha na Wyspie Tybrowej," *Analecta Cracoviensia* 21–22 (1989/90): 505–525; Valentino Pace, " 'Nihil innovetur nisi quod traditum est': sulla scultura del Medioevo a Roma," in *Studien zur Geschichte der europäischen Skulptur im 12./13. Jahrhundert*, vol. 1 (Frankfurt am Main: Henrich, 1994), 588; Ute Dercks, "Die Adlerkapitelle in der Krypta von San Bartolomeo all'Isola in Rom", in *Europas Mitte um 1000*, 809–812.

175   *Papsturkunden*, no. 522 of 1 VIII 1018 (JL 4024), 994.

176   *Papsturkunden*, no. 569 of 17 XII 1027 (JL 4076), 1082; ibid., no. 608 of November 1037 (JL 4110), 1145.

177   JL 4163, *Sancti Leonis IX Romani Pontificis Epistolae et decreta pontificia*, PL, vol. 143, Parisiis 1882, col. 601 D–602 A.

178   Benz, *Untersuchungen zur politischen Bedeutung*, fn. 7 on 76. Johann Friedrich Böhmer, *Regesta Imperii*, vol. 2, *Sächsisches Haus: 919–1024*, part 3: *Die Regesten des Kaiserreiches unter Otto III.*, issue 2, ed. M. Uhlirz (Graz and Cologne: Böhlau, 1957), no. 1279 e, 691.

179   The foundation of the church, which originally was to have celebrated another patron, may have happened earlier, but in 997 it was dedicated to St. Adalbert. See Falkenstein, *Otto III. und Aachen*, 119–124; Bömer, *Regesta Imperii*, vol. 2, part III: issue 1, ed. Mathilde Uhlirz (Graz and Cologne: Böhlau, 1956), no. 1239, 664.

180   Benz, *Untersuchungen zur politischen Bedeutung*, fn. 7 on 76.

which elements of the existing structure have their roots in Ottonian times.[181] It seems, however, that at least the crypt can be dated to such an early period,[182] although not all scholars share this view.[183]

There are also two narrative sources that provide us with information about the beginnings of the church on the Tiber Island: Ademar of Chabannes's *Chronicle*, briefly, in one sentence in one of its variants,[184] and the Translation of Saints Abundius and Abundantius. While the former brings nothing new to our knowledge of the origins of the church in question, the Translation provides us with plenty of interesting details.

It is part of a larger corpus of texts which—as it is often the case in hagiography—recount one by one the story of the martyrdom,[185] translation and posthumous glory of St. Abundius and his companions.[186] At some point, for reasons that will become obvious in a moment, the author invokes the figure of St. Adalbert,[187] describing briefly the martyr's life. Adalbert—he says—was a bishop in the land of the Slavs (*in Sclavonia*). He resigned his office, when he noticed that the faithful were indulging their evil proclivities. He then spent many days as a monk at the Roman Church of St. Boniface and lived there until Emperor Otto arrived in the Eternal City. Following the monarch's orders, he had to return to his abandoned flock. When it turned out that people of the diocese did not agree to the return of their bishop, Adalbert went to another Slavic land (*in aliam Sclavoniam*), inhabited by pagans, to preach the Word of God to them. The pagans did not want to listen to him and killed him.

---

181   Cf. divergent opinions of several scholars: Émile Mâle, "Etudes sur les églises romaines. L'empereur Otton III à Rome et les églises du Xe siècle," *Revue des deux mondes* 41 (107), (1937): 63–64; Richard Krautheimer, *Rom. Schicksal einer Stadt, 312–1308*, translation from English 1980 (Leipzig: Beck, 1987), 188, 280; Jean.-Pierre Caillet, "Les Horizons monumentaux de Gerbert d'Aurillac," in *Gerbero d'Aurillac da Abate di Bobbio a Papa dell'Anno 1000*, 691.

182   Dercks, "Die Adlerkapitelle in der Krypta," 809–812.

183   Caillet, "Les Horizons monumentaux," 691.

184   *Ademari Cabannensis Chronicon*, ed. Pascale Bourgain, Corpus Christianorum. Continuatio Mediaevalis 129 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1999), lib. III, cap. 31, 154 (version γ).

185   BHL 17; the most recent edition—*Atti dei ss. Abbondio, Abbodanzio, Marciano e Giovanni*, in Mario Mastrocola, *Note storiche circa le diocesi di Civita C., Orte e Gallese*, Collana storica "Pian Paradiso". Studi della Chiesa nell'Alto Lazio 1 (Civita Castellana: Pian Paradisi, 1964), 235–248.

186   BHL 18; the most recent edition—*Inventio atque translatio sanctorum Abundii et Abundantii ex codice Ariananiensi descripta*, in Mastrocola, *Note storiche*, 249–252.

187   The relevant fragment is in: *Inventio atque translatio sanctorum Abundii et Abundantii*, 249–250.

As we can see, these words were written by a man who was quite knowl-
edgeable about the actual course of events, although we can point out cer-
tain inaccuracies. The pagans to whom Adalbert went on his mission lived in
Prussia, not in Poland, as the author claims (the term "another Slavic land"
denotes, of course, Poland). We also know, from well-informed sources, that
in 996 the question of Adalbert's return to Prague was considered by the pope
together with the bishops, and that the decision that was taken at the time was
taken by the Holy See.[188] The hagiographer, on the other hand, attributes this
decision to Otto III. Who knows, however, he might be right to some degree—
Adalbert's case could hardly have been resolved without any consultation with
the emperor and without his consent. The matter concerned a bishop of whom
he was the sovereign and we know very well how much the monarch's will mat-
tered in the life of the Church. Rather, we can suspect that the pro-imperial
tendency of the earliest *vitae* prevented their authors from showing Otto's full
responsibility in that case.[189] If so, then we are not dealing with an error but
only with a simplification, which did not necessarily result from the fact that
the author of the translation was not well-informed.

However, if the hagiographer presented the circumstances in which the
Bishop of Prague had eventually left Rome in a different light than the *Vitae* of
St. Adalbert, this means that he drew not on the written documents but on oral
accounts. Thus he could not have been writing many years later after the events
he described, as the information concerning the vicissitudes of Adalbert's life
testifies to his considerable familiarity.

Indeed, the analyzed fragment begins with the following dating: "[…]
imperante Domno nostro piissimo et aeterno Augusto, Othone magno III
Imperatore, anno primo Sanctissimi ac Beatissimi Apostolici summi Pontificis
Silvestri Pape Urbis Romae […]".[190] The dating formula seems to suggest
that if the hagiographer was not writing in Otto III's times, then at least he
remembered them well. Otherwise, he would not have referred to the emperor
as "our" lord.[191] It is also worth noting two other facts that lead to the same

---

188   See Labuda, *Święty Wojciech*, 155.

189   Trawkowski, "Pielgrzymka Ottona III do Gniezna," 123.

190   *Inventio atque translatio sanctorum Abundii et Abundantii*, 249 ("During the rule of our
       lord, the most devout and pious and eternally august Otto III the great, emperor, in the
       first year of the most holy and blessed apostlic and highest bishop, Silvester, pope at
       the city of Rome").

191   Unless the formula was mechanically copied from a *notitia* or, rather, a piece of parch-
       ment attached to some relics and testifying to their authenticity and to the translation
       that had taken place. In fact, there is no need to express such a reservation, because
       Ottonian hagiographers used dating referring to the reign of various rulers, which was

conclusion. Poland is described in the work as Sclavonia. We can sense in it the atmosphere of c. 1000, when the name "Poland" had not yet been consolidated and when the Piast state was described in Europe simply as the land of the Slavs.[192] And the second circumstance: the place where St. Adalbert stayed as a monk is referred to by the author as the Church of St. Boniface (Boniface of Tarsus). This was the original dedication of the church. Towards the end of the 10th century another name was added, namely that of St. Alexius, and for some times both names were used simultaneously. Over the course of the 11th and 12th centuries, the second dedication completely supplanted the first.[193] Therefore, the hagiographer must have been writing around year 1000, if he did not mention St. Alexius.[194]

The author of the translation does not end his story with the death of the Bishop of Prague, but follows the events that happened after that. We have the emperor himself setting out with a magnificent entourage on a journey to the land of the Slavs to obtain Adalbert's relics. From his journey he brings back to Rome the arms of the martyr and adorns them with gold and jewels. While in the Eternal City, he builds a church between two bridges, dedicates it to Adalbert and elevates it to a high rank. Finally, he composes a life of the saint and has it written down.[195]

---

particularly the case in the Roman hagiography of that period; See v. von Falkenhausen, "Gregor von Burtscheid," 244–247.

192   The same argument is used by Mieczysław Rokosz in dating the translation to an early period, Rokosz, "Inter duos pontes," 518.

193   Bernard Hamilton, "The Monastery of S. Alessio and the Religious and Intellectual Renaissance of Tenth-Century Rome," *Studies in Medieval and Renaissance History* 2 (1965): 265, 269, 271.

194   It has been quite commonly accepted that the *Translation of Saints Abundius and Abundantius* is a work written soon after 1000 or at least a work reliable in what it says about St. Adalbert and Otto III; see e.g. Karwasińska, "Studia krytyczne nad żywotami św. Wojciecha, biskupa praskiego. III," 19 with fn. 10; Rokosz, "Inter duos pontes", 518; Fried, "Gnesen—Aachen—Rom", 239. Carlo Cecchelli dates the work to the late 11th century, Carlo Cecchelli, *Studi e documenti sulla Roma sacra*, Società Romana di Storia Patria 18, vol. 2 (Rome: Presso la Società alla Biblioteca Vallicelliana, 1951), 33.

195   "Quo audito Rex, ardorem tanti martyris non ferens, cum senatu Romano et episcopis et clericis extra montes in Sclavoniam pergit ad educendas Romam reliquias beati martiris Adalberti. Qui manus eius auferens auro et gemmis mirum exornavit et Ecclesiam nomine eius inter duos pontes fabricavit et magnae dignitati reddidit, nec non ortum eius, actus et passionem mira arte composuit et in libello scribi fecit" (*Inventio atque translatio sanctorum Abundii et Abundantii*, 250)—"Having heard this, the king, not bearing the fire of such a martyr, proceeded beyond the mountains in Sclavonia along with the Roman senate, bishops, and clerics, to bring back to Rome the relics of the blessed martyr

Thus we have arrived at a fragment in which the hagiographer mentions the Tiber Island foundation. I will return to it in a moment. First, I should like to comment on what the author writes about the transfer of the remains of St. Adalbert. In the literature on the subject scholars have sometimes referred to this fragment of the translation, saying that in fact Otto III failed to implement his plan: he hoped to obtain the martyr's whole body and Bolesław Chrobry only gave him an arm or a hand.[196] The source is question does not seem to justify such a far-reaching interpretation. We can read in it that the monarch wanted to bring to Rome "reliquias beati martiris Adalberti", but the term *reliquiae* does not suggest by any means that it was about the whole body, because it may refer to any part of it. If the hagiographer had really wanted to express an opinion that the emperor's hopes were dashed, he would have used a more unequivocal term of *corpus* or even *totum corpus*. In fact, he does not say anything of the sort. He just wants to say that the monarch went to Poland to bring the martyr's remains and he did obtain them. At the same time he specifies they were the saint's hands (hand?). This was no small matter.[197] It must be stressed very strongly that the narrative does not contain the slightest suggestion that Otto did not accomplish his objectives.

Incidentally, here, too, the hagiographer demonstrates his considerable knowledge. As we learn from other sources, the emperor did indeed bring St. Adalbert's arm from Gniezno;[198] moreover, we know that the martyr's mortal remains have been in the Tiber Island church since time immemorial.[199]

Particularly interesting are the following sentences:[200] they tell us that, having built St. Adalbert's Church, Otto III ordered that bodies of saints be

---

Adalbert. Raising up the relics in his own hands, he adorned them wonderfully with gold and gemstones, and built a church in his name between two bridges and raised it to great dignity. He also composed with remarkable skill a narrative of his birth, deeds, and passion, and had it written down in a book."

196   Fried, *Otto III. und Boleslaw Chrobry*, 93 with fn. 123; Urbańczyk, "Paliusz Gaudentego," 245.

197   Jacek Banaszkiewicz, "Otton III jedzie do Gniezna. O oprawie ceremonialnej wizyty cesarza w kraju i stolicy Polan," in *Trakt cesarski*, 277–315, especially 288–299.

198   Gall, lib. I, cap. 6, 19; *Cantica Medii Aevi*, verse 9a, 13.

199   Casimiro da Roma, *Memorie istoriche delle Chiese, e dei Conventi dei frati Minori della Provincia Romana* (Roma: P. Rosati, 1764 [recte: 1744]), 264–332, especially 288 ff. Cecchelli, *Studi e documenti sulla Roma*, 34–40.

200   "Tunc incepit inquerere [sc. imperator] corpora sanctorum martyrum et praecepit, ut ubicunque inventi fuissent, ad Ecclesiam beati Adalberti deportarentur et nuntiatum est illi, quod in ecclesia beati Abundii et Abundantii martyrum quae est iuxta montem Soractis erant plurima sanctorum martyrum corpora, qui misit suos nuncios Episcopos et

looked for everywhere and that they be brought to the church in question. This is how the translation of the relics of Saints Abundius, Abundantius and Theodora came about.[201] We know from other sources that the emperor brought the remains of St. Bartholomew the Apostle from Benevento and chose the Tiber Island as their resting place. Another body placed in the church during Otto III's reign was that of St. Paulinus of Nola. I will return to these last two translations later.

Some scholars have noted the fact that relics of various saints were being collected on the Tiber Island. Aleksander Gieysztor, referring to an idea put forward by Carlo Cecchelli,[202] commented on this in the following manner: "The consolidation of the cult basis of the foundation by so many saints at the same time may suggest that the emperor was afraid that the cult of St. Adalbert, so dear to him, might not be sufficiently recognized and might not justify the founding of a church in Rome dedicated to the new saint, despite the fact that an imperial edition of the first *vita* was made there already in 999".[203] Mieczysław Rokosz's view was similar: "[…] the emperor must have nevertheless realized that, on their own, the relics of St. Adalbert—well-remembered

---

clericos et monacos ut cum omni honore et diligentia et hymnis Dei ad Ecclesiam beati Adalberti ea deferrent. Qui protinus abierunt et coeperunt inquirere, ubi essent tumuli eorum. Et invenerunt in uno tumulo eorum corpora Beatorum Abundii et Abundantii posita et in alio corpus beatae Theodorae, que in predio suo eos sepelierat. Invenerunt etiam inter eos sanctos martyres qui habebant inauratas vestes et mire exornatas et super altare eorum, mensam sculptam et nimis decoratam. Et deportata sunt omnia secundum iussum Imperatoris ad Ecclesiam sancti Adalberti martyris" (*Inventio atque translatio sanctorum Abundii et Abundantii*, 250)—"Then he [the emperor] began to seek the bodies of the holy martyrs, and decreed that wherever they should be found, they should be carried to the church of Saint Adalbert. And it was announced to him that there were many bodies of holy martyrs in the church of Saints Abundius and Abundantius (which is located near Mons Soractis). He sent as his messengers bishops and clerics and monks in order that they should, with all honours and diligence and hymns to God, bring these [bodies] to the church of Saint Adalbert. They went forthwith and began to seek out where their [the martyrs'] tombs might be. And they found placed in one of their tombs the bodies of Saints Abundius and Abundantius, and in another one the body of Saint Theodora, who had buried them on her estate. Furthermore, they found among them holy martyrs who had gilded vestments that were wonderfully adorned, and over their altar a sculpted and highly decorated table. And all these things were carried off to the church of Saint Adalbert the Martyr according the command of the emperor."

201 For more on the translation of the bodies of SS. Abundius, Abundantius and Theodora, see Cecchelli, *Studi e documenti*, 33.

202 Cecchelli, *Studi e documenti*, 33.

203 Gieysztor, "Rzymska studzienka," 338.

by the Roman elite of the period as he was and dear to the emperor's heart as they were—could not guarantee that a more lively centre of cult of universal significance would emerge in Rome as he intended. For the dominant cult there was the pietism of the most venerable Apostles Peter and Paul, patrons of the city. In addition, there were signs everywhere of a deeply rooted cult of numerous other martyrs. That is why, perhaps, Otto tried to strengthen this fresh cult of the Slavic martyr by bringing in other relics".[204] Bearing in mind the interpretation proposed by Carlo Cecchelli and accepted by Aleksander Gieysztor and Mieczysław Rokosz, I shall try to formulate my own opinion on the matter.

In order to understand Otto III's intentions, we need to examine similar cases, better documented by sources than the Tiber Island foundation. Among them, two Carolingian monasteries come to the fore: Saint-Germain d'Auxerre, with an extremely interesting corpus of texts, and Centula. I shall use other sources and other facts as well, but my argument will be based on these two examples.

The Auxerre monastery[205] owed its splendour to the fame of St. Germanus. He was the first bishop of the city (418–c. 448), whose pastoral and political work went beyond the local borders. He won recognition thanks to his expeditions to Britain, where he not only successfully opposed the Pelagian heresy, but also took part in the defence against the Picts and the Saxons. He saved Armorica from an invasion by the Alans, skilfully negotiating with them, and when its inhabitants were threatened by Aetius, he went to the court in Ravenna to plead with the emperor to intervene. Germanus was among those clerics who brought the cult of relics to Gaul and who promoted monastic life at its very beginning. We know that he founded a monastery in Auxerre, later known as the Monastery of Saints Cosmas and Damian.

He died in Ravenna during the mission I have just mentioned, and his body was immediately transported to his homeland. Hitherto Bishops of Auxerre had been buried at Montarte, in an old Roman cemetery situated west of the city fortifications.[206] Now the custom was abandoned and the man of God was

---

204 Mieczysław Rokosz, "Z ottońskiej propagandy kultu św. Wojciech (Jeszcze raz o rzymskiej fundacji na Wyspie Tybrowej)," *Studia Warmińskie* 30 (1993): 57–58.

205 For more on this monastery, see first of all *Saint-Germain d'Auxerre*, passim; *L'Ecole carolingienne d'Auxerre de Muretach à Remi 830–908*, ed. Dominique Iogna-Prat, Colette Jeudy, and Guy Lobrichon (Paris: Beauchesne, 1991). For information about Auxerre as an intellectual centre, see also Pierre Riché, "Les Ecoles d'Auxerre au IXᵉ siècle," in *La Chanson de geste*, vol. 1, 111–117.

206 For more on the religious topography of Auxerre in late Antiquity and the earliest Middle Ages, see Jean-Charles Picard, "Espace urbain et sépultures épiscopales à Auxerre," in *La Christianisation des pays entre Loire et Rhin (IVᵉ–VIIᵉ siècle). Actes du colloque de Nanterre*

buried in St. Maurice's Chapel, which Germanus had built outside Auxerre's walls, on the northern side. The bishop may have wanted to be buried near the relics—which he had himself brought there—of the head of the Theban Legion, hoping that the saint would help him on Doomsday. From that moment the chapel became an episcopal necropolis where many of Germanus' successor found their final resting place.[207]

Soon after he died he was proclaimed a saint.[208] A peculiar feature of the cult was that initially it spread more quickly outside his home town than in Auxerre itself. The first *vita*, unequivocally hagiographic, was written by Constantius, a man who had nothing in common with his protagonist, and the person who commissioned the work was Patientius, Bishop of Lyon. In 6th-century Gaul St. Germanus had a reputation of a miracle-worker and his tomb attracted believers from all regions of this huge country. The fame of this man of God was witnessed at the time by none other than Gregory of Tours himself. In the 6th century Germanus' holiness, now acknowledged unreservedly in his homeland, became an important element of the ideological identity of the Bishopric of Auxerre, and the funeral chapel of St. Maurice, having lost its original dedication, was transformed into St. Germanus' Chapel.

In the Merovingian period—at a time that is difficult to determine more precisely—a male monastery was established there. Initially, it developed under the care of local bishops, and during the reign of Pepin the Short it became a royal abbey. It experienced its heyday in the 9th century, becoming an important place on the political map of the Frankish Empire, and, above all, playing a crucial role in intellectual development in the Carolingian era. In the second and third quarter of the 9th century it had some powerful protectors: Charles the Bald[209] and the House of Welf.[210]

(*3–4 mai 1974*), 1st edition—1976, ed. Pierre Riché (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1993), 205–222; *Saint-Germain d'Auxerre*, 3–11.

207 For more on the sepulchres of the Bishops of Auxerre in Antiquity and early Middle Ages, see Wollasch, *Das Patrimonium beati Germani*, 192 f. Picard, "Espace urbain et sépultures épiscopales," passim; *Saint-Germain d'Auxerre*, 156–160.

208 For more on the beginnings of the cult of St. Germanus, see Picard, "Espace urbain et sépultures épiscopales", 209–210, 212, 219–221.

209 The relations between the monastery and the Carolingians is examined by e.g. Wollasch, "Das Patrimonium beati Germani," 185–224; Carlrichard Brühl, *Palatium und Civitas. Studien zur Profantopographie spätantiker Civitates vom 3. bis 13. Jahrhundert*, vol. 1: *Gallien* (Cologne and Vienna: Weidmann, 1975), 122–123, 127–129; Yves Sassier, "Les Carolingiens et Auxerre," in *L'Ecole carolingienne d'Auxerre*, 21–36.

210 For information about the abbey and the Welfs, see, in addition to works listed in the previous footnote, René Louis, *De l'histoire à la légende. Girart, comte de Vienne (. . . 819–877) et ses fondations monastiques* (Auxerre: Imprimerie Moderne, 1946), 32–34; Janet L. Nelson,

Charles the Bald sought to bind the monastery to him as much as possible and turn it into a strong basis for his policy. It is difficult to draw up a complete list of abbots for that era; however, we have a right to believe that in some period Saint-Germain d'Auxerre did not have an abbot at all. In practice this meant that it was personally managed by the king. On other occasions the office was held by the monarch's sons: first Lothar and after his death—Carloman. If the son was obedient—and this was the case with Lothar—the monastery was under the strict control of the ruler. Sometimes the monarch resorted to a different solution: he put a lay abbot in charge, for such an abbot was more useful in political matters for the crown than a clergyman.

On the other hand, we know that the ruler cared for the abbey's material prosperity and contributed significantly to an increase of its wealth. It is worth noting that Saint-Germain d'Auxerre was one of three monasteries for which Charles the Bald issued the biggest number of diplomas—the first was Saint-Denis, the second was Saint-Martin in Tours and the third was Saint-Germain.

Auxerre was not among the monarch's most important residencies; nevertheless, Charles the Bald spent some time there on several occasions, staying, it would seem, at Saint-Germain. In 863 the monastery was the venue of an important family and political event—the wedding of Charles the Bald's daughter and Baldwin, Count of Flanders. Generally, we can say that the monarch fully trusted the monks of St. Germanus. The best evidence of this is the fact that he gave them his son Lothar to be educated by them; of course this was when Lothar was not yet their abbot.

However, Saint-Germain d'Auxerre owed its greatness not only to the ruling royal family, but also to the Welfs, above all to Conrad the Elder and his wife Adelaide. Both belonged to the highest circles of the imperial aristocracy. Through his sister Judith, Conrad was Charles the Bald's uncle and through his sister Emma—Louis the German's brother-in-law. Adelaide, on the other hand, was a daughter of Hugh, Count of Tours, a very influential man at the court of Charlemagne and Louis the Pious. She was related to Emperor Lothar I, who was married to her sister Ermengarde.

Some scholars suspect that Conrad the Elder was a lay abbot at Saint-Germain. We cannot be certain of that, though. There are no indications either that he was the Count of Auxerre. Thus, if we were to delve into why he became interested in the cult of St. Germanus, we would have to look for the reasons in an inspiration on the part of his wife, who must have come into contact with

---

"Charles le Chauve et les utilisations du savoir," in *L'Ecole carolingienne d'Auxerre*, 45 with fn. 66 on 52–53.

the abbey and its heavenly patron even before her marriage. We know that her father, the aforementioned Hugh, ruled the County of Sens and Auxerre. What the abbey owed to the marriage mentioned above was, first of all, an expansion of the church, of which I will write more in a moment. Other figures associated with the Saint-Germain monastery and with Auxerre included Conrad and Adelaide's two sons, Hugh and Conrad II. Hugh, one of the most powerful political figures among Western Franks in the last decades of the 9th century, was a lay abbot at Saint-Germain, while Conrad II held the title of Count of Auxerre. In addition, both Conrad the Elder and Hugh found their final resting place at St. Germanus'.

There is no doubt that the interest of Charles the Bald's family and the Welfs in the monastery stemmed to some extent from the veneration they had for its heavenly patron. Let us note a few facts. I have already mentioned some of them and will write about the others in greater detail later. The ceremonial translations of Germanus' body were carried out on the orders of the monarch and with his participation. Prince Lothar founded a precious reliquary for the saint's mortal remains;[211] in addition, he commissioned Hericus to prepare hagiographic texts devoted to the holy man. Conrad and Adelaide, grateful for the favours bestowed on them, expanded Germanus' shrine. Charles the Bald himself experienced the salvific power of the Bishop of Auxerre at a very difficult moment of his life.

The story of Germanus' life and his posthumous fame explains the attraction of the saint's cult. He was not only a local saint, important to the church he had founded and in which he was buried, and to the bishopric the see which he had held. As we know, his work on earth spread to Gaul and Britain, and his fame as a miracle-worker was equal to that of the most famous thaumaturgists in the Merovingian monarchy. It is, therefore, not surprising that Charles the Bald, who readily surrendered himself to the protection of various saints,[212] also thought about Germanus of Auxerre.

---

211   See *Mélanges René Louis*, vol. 1, CXLI.

212   For more on Charles the Bald's interest in the cult of saints, see Pierre Riché, "Charles le Chauve et la culture de son temps," in *Jean Scot Erigène et l'Histoire de la Philosophie*, Colloques internationaux du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique 561 (Paris: Centre national de la recherche scientifique, 1977), 41–42; John Michael Wallace-Hadrill, *The Frankish Church* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983), 246–247; Klaus Herbers, "Rom im Frankenreich—Rombeziehungen durch Heilige in der Mitte des 9. Jahrhunderts," in *Mönchtum-Kirche-Herrschaft 750–1000*, ed. Dieter R. Bauer, Rudolf Hiestand and Brigitte Kasten (Sigmaringen: Thorbecke, 1998), 165–166.

The monastery's political and religious standing was accompanied by intel-lectual development. For sixty years, beginning with the 830s, the monas-tery ran an excellent school with a galaxy of masters like Muterach, Haymo or Remigius. The most outstanding representatives of that school included *Heiricus*, Hericus (b. 841, d. 875 or soon after that date).[213] He himself was a pupil of Haymo as well as Lupus of Ferrières. He may not have personally met Johannes Scotus Eriugena, but he nevertheless was greatly influenced by his Neoplatonism.

Commissioned by Prince Lothar (d. 864), Hericus prepared a corpus of texts devoted to the patron of his monastery, Saint Germanus. He wrote a *vita* in verse,[214] drawing extensively on the biography written by Constantius of Lyon. It must be said at this point that he used an interpolated version, written prob-ably in the first half of the 9th century.[215] In addition, he wrote two *Books of Miracles*, which he completed in their original versions in 873, when the entire corpus was dedicated to Charles the Bald. Soon after 25 September 875 he added a substantial interpolation, which in the edition by the Bollandists and Jean-Paul Migne covers chapters 108 to 130.

The most important source for us is the *Miracula* on which I shall focus my attention.[216] I have already referred to the work in question, but I have only mentioned one fact, namely the translation personally carried out by Charles

---

213   A lot of information about Hericus can be found in publications listed in footnote 204.

214   *Heirici Carmina*, ed. Ludwig Traube, MGH *Poetae Latini* (Berlin: Weidmann, 1896), 428–517. See Peter Christian Jacobsen, "Die Vita s. Germani Heirics von Auxerre", in *L'Ecole carolingienne d'Auxerre*, 329–351; Édouard Jeauneau, "Heiric d'Auxerre disciple de Jean Scot", ibid., 353–370.

215   Original version: *Vita Germani episcopi Autissioderensis auctore Constantio*, ed. Wilhelm Levison, MGH SS rerum Merovingicarum, vol. 7 (Hanover and Leipzig: Hahn, 1920), 247–283; see also the most recent edition: *Vie de Saint Germain d'Auxerre*, ed. René Borius, Sources chrétiennes 112 (Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1965). Interpolated version: *Vita Constantio presbytero ex Ms. Chifflentiano cum aliis multis collato*, Acta Sanctorum, vol. 7 Iulii (Paris and Rome: V. Palmé, 1868), 211–232. For more on the historiographic and hagiographic tradition associated with St. Germanus and referred to by Hericus, see Wilhelm Levison, "Bischof Germanus von Auxerre und die Quellen zu seiner Geschichte," *Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde* 29 (1904): 95–175; Thomas Delforge, "Une 'Vita s. Germani' pour Lothaire II," *Scriptorium* 22 (1968): 39–42.

216   For more on the work, see Levison, "Bischof Germanus," 163 f.; Wollasch, "Das Patrimonium Beati Germani," 205–208; Pierre Janin, "Heiric d'Auxerre et les Gesta pon-tificum Autissioderensium", *Francia* 4 (1976), 89–105; Dominique Iogna-Prat, "Le Baptême du schéma des trois ordres fonctionels. L'apport de l'Ecole d'Auxerre dans la seconde moitié du IXe siècle," *Annales. Economies-Sociétés-Civilisations*, 41(1986): no. 1, 101–126; idem, *Agni immaculati. Recherches sur les sources hagiographiques relatives à saint Maïeul*

the Bald.[217] Yet the material—dealing with the cult of relics—included in the source is much richer.

The author writes in it about events, not necessarily miracles, which he did not include in the *vita*. Some of the information concerns the saint's earthly life, but mostly it encompasses facts illustrating the bishop's posthumous fame: the story of his relics and miracles performed through them. While Book I may seem to be a collection of anecdotes, the content of Book II is clearly subordinated to one idea: the author tries to present the history of St. Germanus' shrine and describe the role it played in spiritual life.

The hagiographer does all he can to show his readers how great a grace can be granted to man thanks to the intercession of the holy bishop. That is why he writes about the miracles, such as healings, that happened through Germanus. However, his furthest reaching conclusions were drawn from the following event. Germanus, still a young man, travelled with his disciples across Britain. One day he stood in front of the royal palace and asked to be let in, but the monarch refused, even though the cold winter night had already come. What follows is well-known from, for instance, the Polish legend of Piast and Popiel. The royal swineherd gave the bishop shelter and, consequently, the bishop made him king, chasing out the previous ruler as well as his wife and children. Thus, the country in question is still ruled by the descendants of the swineherd. Hericus cites the authority of Mark, a Briton from Wales, pious anchorite and bishop of that nation. Mark confirmed, under oath, the veracity of the events, stating at the same time that the story had been written down in his homeland[218] and that anyone wishing so, could read it.[219]

We can guess that Mark quoted a dynastic legend, which in his homeland was part of the ideological armoury of the monarchs. Such legends were to explain why the ruling royal family rose to the highest power. They were also to convince the body politic that the rule of the family in question would ensure prosperity for the entire nation. But Hericus was guided by completely

---

de Cluny (*954–994*) (Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1988), 122–132; *Saint-Germain d'Auxerre*, 69, 97–110 and passim.

217   See above in the present chapter, point 3.

218   Indeed, a similar story, with an even bigger number of details can be found in the *History of the Britons* in its two versions (*Historia Brittonum cum additamentis Nennii*, MGH Auctores Antiquissimi, vol. 13, ed. Theodor Mommsen (Berlin: Weidmann, 1898), 172–176.

219   *Miracula sancti Germani*, lib. I, pp. 80–82, col. 1254–1255. See Jacek Banaszkiewicz, *Podanie o Piaście i Popielu. Studium porównawcze nad wczesnośredniowiecznymi tradycjami dynastycznymi* (Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1986), 125–127, 143–146; idem, "Tradycje dynastyczno-plemienne Słowiańszczyzny północnej," in *Ziemie polskie w X w.*, 266.

different considerations, when he included the story in his work. The hagiographer wanted to demonstrate the great power his protagonist had received from heavens: the bishop ordered the iniquitous king to renounce his throne and the king, sensing that Germanus was acting on divine authority, humbly withdrew. The event prompted the author to say that while he had still been in his human body, the saint, together with Christ, managed the earthly affairs, appointed kings and controlled kingdoms. The view is concretized in Book II of the *Miracula*. As we remember, it was thanks to the intercession of St. Germanus that Charles the Bald saved his kingdom from designs of his wicked brother.[220] We can see that the hagiographer attributed a political dimension to the cult he promoted. However, this is not the ultimate interpretation. As the author remarks, he who was able to do so much while still in his earthly body, can now easily lead nations to the Kingdom of Heaven.[221] Hericus thus moved conceptually from an earthly kingdom, which the saint had the power to control, to the Kingdom of Heaven, and interpreted the saint's political function in eschatological terms. Not for nothing is he regarded as a Platonist.

St. Germanus was a great and powerful intercessor of grace and the people of Auxerre drew heavily on its treasure. However, they were able to do so only because the saint's venerable body was in their city. In a rather long apostrophe, the author expresses his gratitude to the bishop for choosing Auxerre as his resting place. This has made it possible for him to continue to take care of the people whom he served as a pastor during his lifetime. The city, situated by nature on a dry rock, with no riches or defensive location, obtained a powerful protector, and its inhabitants could now hope that their moral weaknesses would be turned into strength.[222]

As we can see, Hericus was convinced that the key to the saint's power lay in his relics. It is, therefore, not surprising that their history is the main subject of

---

220   See above in the present chapter, point 3.

221   "O virum inter mortalium agmina singularem! [apostrophe to St. German] O hominem ipsius iam divinitatis symbola praeferentem! Nec dum luteam molem deposuit; et jam cum Christo de mundo decernit, potestates ordinat, regna disponit. Insanum te palam pronuntio, quisquis Germani merito provehi populos ad regna coelestia posse desperas, quem terrenos adhuc vehentem artus tanta potuisse consideras" (*Miracula sancti Germani*, lib. I, no. 82, col. 1246 C)—"O man who is a singular army among mortals! O man bearing symbols of Divinity itself! He did not depose the vile throng; yet now he judges the world with Christ, he regulates the powers, he disposes over the kingdoms. I say openly to you that you are senseless, those of you who have no faith that people can be transported to the celestial kingdoms by Germanus's merit, since you believe him to have been capable of bearing such things with earthly limbs."

222   *Miracula sancti Germani*, lib. I, no. 35, kol. 1223–1224.

the *Miracula*, especially Book II, which is devoted in its entirety to the expansion of the shrine erected around Bishop Germanus' tomb.

The expansion was carried out in two stages. First, a magnificent crypt was built and the saint's body was placed there; then it was filled with relics of other saints. These are facts that can be precisely dated and, to some extent, captured archaeologically.[223] The hagiographer presents an account of these events and, at the same time, makes every effort to demonstrate that the new, magnificent shrine was built only because such was the will of God.

One day—says the author—Conrad the Elder fell gravely ill. He went blind in one eye and felt an acute pain in it. Since doctors, who came from all regions of the Frankish state, were unable to alleviate it, he went to the Saint-Germain abbey in Auxerre and asked its patron saint for help. Conrad recovered and began to think hard how he could repay the saint. Inspired by God,[224] he decided to launch large scale architectural works at the abbey to order to expand the church and add a splendid crypt to it. Divine assistance was felt also during the construction works, which were soon started. And so, despite numerous dangers the builders easily managed to bring marble from Gaul and when the stone blocks began to be installed in the crypt, it turned out that they fitted in perfectly and did not have to be cut. Moreover, once the workers handling the blocks suddenly lost control over the structure and it seemed that everything was inevitably going to collapse. Yet the edifice stood, strengthened by the power of God.[225]

For the duration of the construction works, the local bishop, following an order by Charles the Bald and Louis the German, temporarily elevated the body of St. Germanus in 841.[226] We already know that Charles the Bald personally placed the body of the saint in the new crypt and that this took place on 6 January 860. This translation was followed by miracles, namely the monarch's victory over Louis the German as well as healings of the sick.[227] These were events that in no way contributed to the establishment of the shrine, but in the eyes of their contemporaries they testified to the fact that the construction of the crypt and the placement of the venerable remains in it were in accordance with the will of heavens.

---

223 *Saint-Germain d'Auxerre*, 97–155; see also Christian Sapin, *La Bourgogne préromane. Construction, décor et fonction des édifices religieux* (Paris: Picard, 1986), 41–63.

224 *Miracula sancti Germani*, lib. II, no. 88, col. 1249; see also lib. II, no. 85, col. 1248.

225 Ibid., lib. II, nos. 92–95, col. 1951 f.

226 Ibid., lib. II, no. 96, col. 1253. See Wollasch, "Das Patrimonium Beati Germani," 193; Hardy and Labbé, "En marge du conflit," 137–138.

227 Ibid., lib. II, nos. 103–109, col. 1255–1258.

The second stage came in 875, most likely on 25 September.[228] On that day relics of a considerable number of other saints were placed alongside the body of St. Germanus. It must be emphatically stressed that the transformation of the crypt into a sepulchre for many martyrs and confessors was a very important fact in the eyes of our author. That is why he writes with rigorous accuracy and solemnity about the translations, thanks to which the monastery has recently acquired new relics, and scrupulously records miracles occurring on these occasions.[229] Thus, he tells a story of a journey of the monks to the Eternal City, from which they managed to bring the relics of martyrs, Pope Urban and Tiburtius.[230] He also stresses that when the monks passed through Agaunum on their way back from Rome, they were given the remains of two Knights of the Theban Legion, namely Saints Maurice and Innocent. In another context he notes that monks from Saint-Germain obtained the fingers of Amator, Germanus' predecessor as Bishop of Auxerre.

These remains, like the bodies of many other saints, primarily bishops of Auxerre, who had already been buried in the monastery, were placed in the newly built crypt, surrounding the tomb of St. Germanus from four sides: on the right, that is, from the south, were placed the relics of Pope Urban, the head of St. Innocent and the relics of four of Germanus' successors as bishops mentioned by name; at the feet, that is, from the east—the relics of Bishop Aunari; from the west—the relics of Tiburtius the martyr, several bishops of Auxerre and the youth Moderatus.[231] In yet another context the author mentions that the

---

228   Janin, "Heiric d'Auxerre," 101.

229   Ibid., lib. II, nos. 106–122, col. 1257–1266.

230   See Werner Lühmann, *St. Urban. Beiträge zur Vita und Legende, zum Brauchtum und zur Ikonographie*, Quellen und Forschungen zur Geschichte des Bistums und Hochstift Würzburg 19 (Würzburg: Schöningh, 1968), 52–53; Herbers, "Rom im Frankenreich," 161.

231   "[…] optimum factu iudicatum est, ut supra memoratae martyrum reliquiae, necnon et corpora beatorum pontificum Altissiodorensium, olim in ipsa ecclesia tumulata, transferrentur in cryptas, et circa corpus beatissimi Germani praecipua officii diligentia conderentur: divina mente, probo consilio; ut quos coeli regia continet, ejusdem quoque in terris habitaculi capacitas sociaret. Factum ita est; et dextro quidem latere, id est a plaga Australi, ossa beati Urbani papae cum capite sancti Innocentii martyris eodem loculo composita sunt. Hinc corpus venerabilis Alodii, successoris quondam ejus, ac trium deinde sanctorum pontificum, Ursi, Romani, et Theodosii. A parte pedum, id est a plaga orientali, secus aram, pretiosi confessoris et presulis Aunarii membra sacratissima requiescunt. Sinistrum, id est septentrionale latus, gloriosi martyris Tiburtii pignora occuparunt, subjunctis quinque pontificum corporibus venerandis, hoc est sancti Fraterni episcopi et martyris, Censurii, Gregorii, Desiderii ac Lupi; et extra hos, sancti Moderati pueri, quondam martyrio coronati" (*Miracula sancti Germani*, lib. II, no. 117, col. 1262 f.)— "It was judged best to act in such a way that the relics of the martyrs recorded above,

fingers of St. Amator, the protagonist's spiritual father, were placed before the tomb of the saint, that is, on the western side.[232] This took place earlier, in 871.[233]

As a result, the crypt became a real treasury of relics. What strikes us is the fact that there was a strict hierarchy among them: the body of St. Germanus must have been the most important, if all other remains were placed around it.

This "primacy" stemmed from a conviction that St. Germanus occupied a very high position in the heavenly hierarchy. Hericus would have liked to simply put his protagonist on a par with the Apostles. He does not go that far, however, and, when describing him, he uses the term *vir post apostolos splendissimus*.[234] Thus, the saint does not enjoy the same status as the Apostles, but is superior to all other saints. On the other hand, the hagiographer claims that with his

---

along with the bodies of the holy popes, all of which were once buried in the very same church, should be moved to crypts, and placed around the body of Saint Germanus with special care in ritual. This was to be done with a holy mind and virtuous counsel, so that whoever is contained in the royal domain of heaven should also be brought together in their dwelling on earth. And thus it was done. On the right side, that is on the south, the bones of Saint Urban, the pope, along with the head of Saint Innocent the martyr were placed together in the same small space. Here also the body of the venerable Alodius, his [Germanus's] successor, and of three other holy bishops, Ursus, Romanus, and Theodosius, were placed. At his feet, that is in the east, beside the altar, rest the most holy limbs of the precious confessor and prelate Aunarius. The relics of the glorious martyr Tiburtius occupy the northern, or left side, along with the venerable bodies of five bishops, namely of Saint Fraternus, martyr and bishop, of Censurius, Gregorius, Desiderius, and Lupus, and beyond them is placed the body of Saint Moderatus the boy, crowned by martyrdom." See René Louis, *Autossiodurum christianum. Les églises d'Auxerre des origines au XIᵉ siècle* (Paris: Clavreuil, 1952), 51; idem, "Esquisse d'une histoire du tombeau de Saint Germain d'Auxerre de 448 à nos jours," *L'Echo de St. Pierre d'Auxerre*, 1958 no. 17: 28–30; Carol Heitz, *L'Architecture religieuse carolingienne. Les formes et leurs fonctions* (Paris: Picard, 1980), 170; Sapin, *La Bourgogne préromane*, 50–52; J. Roumailhac, "Dans la confession de l'abbaye Saint-Germain d'Auxerre: la disposition des corps saints autour de celui de Germain selon les Miracula sancti Germani d'Heiric," *Bulletin de la Société des Fouilles Archéologiques et des Monuments Historiques de l'Yonne* 2 (1985): 17–22 (on p. 21 a hypothetical diagram of the layout of the relics).

232 *Miracula sancti Germani*, lib. II, no. 106, col. 1257. These were the same fingers believed to have cut the tonsure on Germanus' head, thanks to which he devoted himself to serving God. See *Vita Constantio presbytero* (interpolated version), 3–5, 213–214; *Heirici Carmina*, vv. 199, 444. For this reason, too, we can suspect that the relic was on the western side—by Germanus' head. For some unknown reason, neither R. Louis nor J. Roumailhac asks—in the publications listed in the previous footnote—where the fingers of St. Amator were put.

233 Janin, "Heiric d'Auxerre", 100.

234 *Miracula sancti Germani*, lib. I, no. 35, col. 1223.

merits Germanus is the equal of St. Peter.[235] There is no doubt either that he was, in essence, an apostle after all. *Vir apostolicus* and *apostolicus pater*— these are terms used with reference to him.[236] There are several facts in the work which concretize that view. For instance, Hericus notes—though he does it as if in passing—that the Diocese of Auxerre was Christianized only during the times of the saint in question. He was not the first bishop of the city, but he was the first to have limited the influence of paganism, which had hitherto flourished.[237] The author is more emphatic, when he writes about his protagonist carrying the Christian faith to foreign peoples living in Britain.[238] In this case he lays more stress on the fight against heresy than the fight against paganism.

In the eyes of the hagiographer, apostolicity is the most important but by no means the only claim to glory. Among those that Hericus cites, let us examine just two, rather unusual in Germanus' case. First, he was a martyr. This is evidenced by the numerous and painful crosses he carried all his life.[239] In addition, he was a virgin, for although in his youth he married a woman, he gave up the marital bed as soon as he was ordained priest.[240] Moreover—and this is the most important argument—the chastity of the holy man, compared in the text to the whiteness of the snow, was never tainted.[241]

In these circumstances we cannot help thinking: if it is true, as Hericus argues, that Germanus was a great saint and a powerful intercessor thanks to whom people could partake in the abundance of heavenly grace, if this man of God has so many claims to glory in him—if all this is true, then why was the monastery not satisfied with the fact that its patron was put in the crypt, but added to his relics also those of many other martyrs and confessors? It must be noted that, according to the author, the placing of the bodies and remains of other saints in the crypt was in accordance with God's will. In order to justify his view, the hagiographer uses the following argument: the room in which the remains of St. Germanus were laid to rest was large enough to house more than

---

235   *Heirici Carmina*, vv. 186–200, 457–458.

236   *Miracula sancti Germani*, lib. i, no. 34, col. 1223; lib. ii, no. 83, col. 1246.

237   *Miracula sancti Germani*, lib. i, no. 37, col. 1225 B.

238   *Heirici Carmina*, vv. 430–499, 469–471; *Miracula sancti Germani*, lib. i, no. 80, col. 1244–1245.

239   *Heirici Carmina*, vv. 186–195, 457.

240   *Heirici Carmina*, vv. 44–47, 454.

241   *Heirici Carmina*, vv. 201–236, 458–459.

the body of just one saint. Apparently, heavens must have predicted that such a need would arise in the future.[242]

There are several answers that come to mind with regard to the above question and these answers are not necessarily mutually exclusive. First, we should note that the placing of many holy bishops of Auxerre in one crypt was a manifestation of the sacred nature of the bishopric itself, revealed in the holiness of, if not all, then at least of most of its bishops.[243] This idea was at the centre of the ideology of many local Churches in the Carolingian era, expressed not only in episcopal necropoles set up in some cities but also in special works of historiography known as *Gesta episcoporum*.[244] They present the history of a diocese as a sequence of pontificates, stressing the holiness of the diocese's founders, often disciples of the Apostles, sometimes even of Christ himself, but also emphasizing the holiness of its successive bishops. It is worth mentioning here that such *Gesta* were written also in Auxerre and that the cathedral canons wrote them more or less at the same time as Hericus put his *Miracula* to the parchment.[245] When examining the issue from this point of view, we could conclude that the bringing of the Roman martyrs, especially Pope Urban, was to make people aware of the communion of St. Germanus' bishopric with the See of Peter.

---

242 *Miracula sancti Germani*, lib. II, no. 108, col. 1258.

243 Michel Sot, "Organisation de l'espace et historiographie épiscopale dans quelques cités de la Gaule carolingienne," in *Le métier d'historien au Moyen Age. Etudes sur l'historiographie médiévale*, ed. Bernard Guenée, Publication de la Sorbonne. Série "Etudes" 13 (Paris: Université de Paris I Panthéon-Sorbonne. Centre de recherches sur l'histoire de l'Occident médiéval, 1977), 42–43.

244 Sot, "Organisation de l'espace," 31–43, especially 39–40; idem, *Gesta episcoporum, gesta abbatum*, Typologie des sources du Moyen Age 37 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1981), especially 18–21; for more on the various functions of the *Gesta episcoporum*, see idem, "Arguments hagiographiques et historiographiques dans les 'Gesta episcoporum'," in *Hagiographie, cultures et sociétés. Actes du colloque organisé à Nanterre et à Paris (2–5 mai 1979)*, (Paris Etudes Augustiniennes, 1981), 96–104; an important supplement: idem, "Le Liber de episcopis Mettensibus dans l'histoire du genre 'Gesta episcoporum'," in *Paolo Diacono. Uno scrittore fra tradizione longobarda e rinovamento carolingio. Atti del Convegno Internazionale di Studi, Cividale del Friuli—Udine, 6–9 maggio 1999*, ed. Paolo Chiesa (Udine: Forum, 2000), 527–549. Studies by other scholars that must be taken into account include Reinhold Kaiser, "Die Gesta episcoporum als Genus der Geschichtsschreibung," in *Historiographie im frühen Mittelalter*, ed. Anton Scharer and Georg Scheibelreiter, Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Österrreichische Geschichtsforschung 32 (Vienna and Munich: Oldenbourg, 1994), 459–480.

245 Janin, "Heiric d'Auxerre," passim; Sot, *Gesta episcoporum*, 29–31.

On the other hand, it was widely believed that each saint had his own merits thanks to which he could obtain God's blessing for people living on earth. Thus, if relics of a more substantial number of saints were gathered in one place, the treasury of merits would be greater, and, as a result, access to God's grace would become much easier. This was the line of reasoning of Hericus, who clearly states that the remains of the Roman martyrs came to St. Germanus' monastery to protect it and to add splendour to it by means of miracles.[246] Yet the hagiographer knew very well that, in fact, it was about something more than merely a simple adding up of saints and their merits. He expresses his opinion most emphatically in two fragments of his work.

First, wondering why other remains were placed in the crypt housing the body of St. Germanus, he gives the following answer: it was about bringing together the saints, who live in heaven in the same palace, in one earthly home.[247] It is an interesting view, for we learn from it that the relics personified the entire Kingdom of Heaven, not only the various martyrs or confessors, provided, however, that they were the remains of not one but of many saints.[248]

When it comes to Hericus's work, the most interesting fragment can be found elsewhere. The author compares the Saint-Germain crypt to the *Sancta Sanctorum*, the most sacred place in the temple of Jerusalem, and concludes that although there are considerable similarities between the two shrines, Germanus' resting place is superior to the Jewish original, because it deserves greater veneration and gives greater possibilities of salvation. Although the *Sancta Sanctorum* housed the Ark of the Covenant and other symbols of the truth that was to be revealed in the future, the crypt housed the tombs of numerous martyrs and confessors, which were monuments of a victory that had already been achieved. While in the case of the Jerusalem sanctuary only one priest had the right to enter it once a year to ask for the sins of the people to be taken away, in the case of Auxerre everyone could go to its shrine any day they wished and in full confidence ask for the expiation of their sins. Finally,

---

246   *Miracula sancti Germani*, lib. ɪɪ, no. 108, col. 1258.

247   *Miracula sancti Germani*, lib. ɪɪ, no. 117, col. 1262–1263 (the relevant fragment is quoted in fn. 230). This concretizes a more general view whereby the topography of burials in a church and arround it reflected the place the souls occupied in heaven; see Arnold Angenendt, "In porticu ecclesiae sepultus. Ein Beispiel von himmlisch-irdischer Spiegelung," in *Iconologia sacra*, 68–80.

248   See Günter Bandmann, "Früh- und Hochmittelalterliche Altaranordnung als Darstellung," in *Das erste Jahrtausend*, Textband 1, 392.

the last difference: in the Jewish sanctuary animals were offered as sacrifices, whereas in the crypt the sacrifice is that of Christ himself.[249]

Given the fact that Mass was celebrated at every altar, the specificity and thus the greatness of the Saint-Germain shrine was determined by the bodies of saints gathered there, saints, that is, people with regard to whom the truth about salvation—merely foretold by the objects kept in the *Sancta Sanctorum*—had come true. It must be noted that Hericus stresses not so much the presence of the bodies, but their great number. In other words, if St. Germanus had been buried in the crypt alone or only with few saints, the place would not have been able to compete with the Jerusalem sanctuary.

However, there was another meaning to the accumulation of the relics. Anyone who goes down to the crypt—says the author—will meet the Lord Jesus. He will see Christ walking with the Apostles, fighting alongside martyrs, confessing his faith with confessors, rejoicing with virgins, reigning surrounded by all saints.[250] As we can see, the author is convinced that by communing with relics people could be in contact with the Saviour.[251] However, Hericus wants, in fact, to tell us something else in this fragment, namely, that full access to Christ will be granted to those who will use the intercession of the many saints gathered in one place. By venerating only the remains of one martyr or the body of a confessor, we touch upon the Saviour's glory from one side only, as it were. Thus, there is a need for the shrine to house the bodies of saints of various categories, that is, apostles, martyrs, confessors and virgins;[252] in addition, there must be many such bodies there, because only in this way will it be

---

249   *Miracula sancti Germani*, lib. ɪɪ, no. 123, col. 1266. For more on interpretations of this fragment, see Iogna-Prat, "Le Baptême," 703 f.

250   "Quem [sc. locum] quotiescunque devotus intraveris, cernere est Christum apostolis consequentem, martyribus compugnantem, confessoribus colloquentem, virginibus collaetantem, sanctis postremo omnibus conregnantem" (*Miracula sancti Germani*, lib. ɪɪ, no. 123, col. 1266)—"Whenever you should devoutly enter that place, you will see Christ walking with the apostles, fighting with the martyrs, speaking with the confessors, rejoicing with the virgins, and finally ruling together with all the saints."

251   See also *Miracula sancti Germani*, lib. ɪɪ, no. 124, col. 1266 f.

252   Careful readers will notice that the Saint-Germain crypt lacked the remains of pious ladies, probably because the principal saint there was a man. This does not mean that there were no virgins in the crypt. After all, Germanus himself was a virgin and so was undoubtedly the boy Moderatus. Nb. another virgin was St. Maxima, whose remains were buried within the premises of the Saint-Germain church, though her body was not placed in the same crypt (*Miracula sancti Germani*, lib. ɪ, no. 33, col. 1222–1223; see also below).

possible to meet the Lord reigning in heaven amidst all the saints. Only after fulfilling these conditions can people fully experience Christ's presence.

Access to the Saviour is through His Body, but Christ's Body is not just one member but a multitude of them.[253] This is one of the reasons why the presence of the patron's mortal remains was not sufficient and why the crypt had to be filled with the relics of many other saints. However, this does not mean that Germanus' authority was diminished among the great number of his companions. On the contrary, the hagiographer very clearly says that the remains of the Roman martyrs came to Auxerre thanks to the merits and intercession of the holy bishop.[254] Thus, Germanus' primacy was based not only on the fact that he was superior to his companions in terms of his claims to glory, but also on the fact that the Saint-Germain shrine was built thanks to his help and intercession.

It is worth noting that Hericus was convinced that his protagonist simply continued from beyond the grave the work he had begun in his earthly life,[255] The bishop brought the relics of St. Alban from Britain, and by the power of his merits contributed to the invention, during his pontificate, of St. Priscus and other martyrs from Roman times.[256] When he died in Ravenna, five holy virgins joined the funeral procession. Three of them died during the journey, two reached their destination and died there, with Porcaria being buried one mile from the city, while Maxima was buried next to the church in which the body of St. Germanus was entombed. Now—notes the author—after the construction works have been completed, the tomb is within the premises of the church.[257]

Let us now look at the final part of the work, in which historians have recently become more interested, because it contains an outline of a social theory. The hagiographer calls on his brothers, monks from Saint-Germain

---

253 Characteristically, some reliquaries from the early and high Middle Ages containing the remains of many saints have an image of the Saviour on the cover. Here is One to whom the saints in the reliquary lead; see Amy G. Remensnyder, "Legendary Treasure at Conques: Reliquaries and Imaginative Memory," *Speculum* 71 (1996): 889–890. For more on the bond between Christ and the relics of saints in Carolingian theology, see J.-M. Sansterre, "Les Justifications du culte des reliques dans le haut Moyen Age," in *Les reliques. Objets, cultes, symboles. Actes du colloque international de l'Université du Littoral-Côte d'Opale (Boulogne-sur-Mer) 4–6 septembre 1997*, ed. Edina Bozóky and Anne-Marie Helvétius, Hagiologia 1 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1999), 81–93, especially 91–92.

254 *Miracula sancti Germani*, lib. II, no. 108, col. 1258.

255 *Saint-Germain d'Auxerre*, 101, 161.

256 *Miracula sancti Germani*, lib. I, nos. 16–17, col. 1214–1215.

257 *Miracula sancti Germani*, lib. I, no. 33, col. 1222–1223.

d'Auxerre, diligently to perform their duties.[258] This idea, developed over a long paragraph, can be summarized in several points. First of all, the author tries to make the monks aware of the uniqueness of their vocation. They constitute a group separated from the general populace and given over to God. While others are engaged in wars or agriculture, the monks (*tertius ordo*), free from earthly concerns, can live a life completely filled with prayer. Their task is twofold: firstly, their duty is to worship God, secondly—to offer prayers of intercession for their debtors, that is, knights and peasants. Hericus understands the scale of the task facing the monks. He is in no doubt, however, that they are able to cope with it thanks to the merits of St. Germanus and other saints whose mortal remains are entombed in the monastery church.[259]

As we can see, by making sure they fulfil the duties of their order, the monks hope for double intercession: first of St. Germanus and then of the other saints. St. Germanus occupies the first and unique place, although the merits of the other martyrs have their significance too.

Another example worth discussing is a Carolingian collection of relics at Centula (today Saint-Riquier). This town in Picardy had an abbey founded in the Merovingian period by St. Richarius, a confessor, monk and hermit. The abbey became an important centre of monasticism in the last decade of the 8th century, during the abbacy of Angilbert, a man from Charlemagne's closest circle.[260] This courtier, whom the monarch liked to use for important political and diplomatic tasks, was a poet and member of the so-called Palace Academy, in which he bore the honourable name of Homer. It is also worth noting that he was in a relationship with Charlemagne's daughter, Princess Bertha, who bore him two sons.

The Carolingian abbey in Centula arouses scholars' interest for two reasons: firstly, owing to its lavish station liturgy introduced there by Angilbert,

---

258   *Miracula sancti Germani*, lib. II, nos. 126–128, col. 1267–1270, especially no. 128, col. 1269–1270. See Iogna-Prat, "Le Baptême," passim; idem, *Agni immaculati*, 122–132.

259   At some point Hericus addresses his brothers in the following manner: "[…] summa igitur ope, summis viribus glorificate Deum, gratis vobis bona tribuentem; veneramini beatum Germanum, ea vobis potentissimae intercessionis suffragio promerentem; caeterosque, ei et templo consortes et merito, pia devotione prosequimini, anxiis affectibus implorate […]"—*Miracula sancti Germani*, lib. II, no. 128, col. 1270 BC ("With the most supreme labour and strength praise God, who freely grants you good things; venerate Saint Germanus, who brings them forth for you with the most potent intercession in his voice; and honour with loving devotion the others who are his companions both in the temple and in merit, beseech them with troubled mind").

260   Many facts from Angilbert's life are presented, with references to sources, by Friedrich Möbius, *Westwerkstudien* (Jena: Friedrich-Schiller-Universität, 1968), 23–28.

secondly—because of the role played by its buildings in the development of architecture. The main abbey church at Saint-Riquier was the first Christian church in the history of art in which the western part was extended so much that it became an aesthetic and functional counterbalance for the eastern choir.[261]

Studies into these issues bring interesting results, thanks to a rich set of sources, unusually varied for the early Middle Ages. The main church no longer exists in its Carolingian form, and the remaining buildings have disappeared from the face of the earth. However, researchers can still use archaeological traces of the churches and also have at their disposal an 11th century representation of the abbey layout, though known not from the original but from two 17th century copies.[262] In addition, there are numerous and highly instructive written sources: primarily texts written by Angilbert himself, namely inscriptions adorning various parts of the main church as well as a description of the furnishings of the abbey and the liturgy celebrated there. An important place among the documents is occupied by the abbey's chronicle written down by one of its monks, Hariulf.[263] He completed the main part of his work in 1088, adding some elements in 1104–1105. Hariulf's work is all the more valuable given the fact that it quotes *in extenso* the above mentioned texts by Angilbert[264] as well as some other important Carolingian sources.

The construction works at Centula were carried out in 790–799 and were closely supervised by Angilbert, who took advantage of a generous support of his father-in-law, Charlemagne. As a result, there emerged a group of religious edifices comprising—apart from the less important oratories—the main church (I will write about its dedications in a moment), the Church of the Virgin Mary and the Apostles, and the Church of St. Benedict and Other Holy Abbots.[265] A characteristic feature of Centula was that the main church

---

261   Piotr Skubiszewski, *L'Art du Haut Moyen Age. L'art européen du VIe au IXe siècle*, French version of the Italian edition 1995 (Baume-les-Dames: Librairie générale française, 1998), 289–291; cf. however the moderating remarks by Jean.-Pierre Caillet, "Le Mythe architectural roman," *Cahiers de Civilisation Médiévale* 43 (2000): 353–358.

262   They were published on many occasions, see e.g. Jean Hubert's paper cited below, *Saint-Riquier*, plate I after 309.

263   Hariulf, ed. Ferdinand Lot.

264   There are various editions of these texts, but I use only that of Ferdinand Lot (see below).

265   For more on the Centula buildings, their architecture and liturgy, for which the architecture provided a venue, see e.g. Jean Hubert, "Saint-Riquier et le monachisme bénédictin en Gaule à l'époque carolingienne," in *Il monachesimo nell'alto medioevo e la formazione della civiltà occidentale*, Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo 4 (Spoleto: Presso la Sede del Centro, 1957), 293–308; Carol Heitz, *Recherches sur les rapports entre architecture et liturgie à l'époque carolingienne. Introduction de Pierre*

housed, under one roof as it were, two shrines, distinguished in architectural and functional terms. In the eastern part, on the ground level of the choir there stood the tomb of St. Richarius and his altar, while on the western side the building was closed by a huge, three-storey westwork. Its centre of cult— the St. Saviour altar—was situated on the second storey. Among the eleven altars that were found in the main church, Angilbert first lists St. Saviour's altar, followed by St. Richarius' altar.[266] This duality was reflected in the dedications. Although Angilbert says that the church was dedicated to the Saviour and All Saints,[267] in other fragments he refers to it as the Church of Our Saviour and St. Richarius.[268] The same double *patrocinium* is given in an inventory of the abbey treasury commissioned by Louis the Pious.[269]

Generally speaking, there were three main shrines at the Centula abbey: of Our Saviour, of St. Richarius and of the Virgin Mary. St. Benedict was clearly inferior to them—it is enough to examine the liturgical rules ordered by Angilbert to be observed on Rogation Days. On the first day the mass was to be celebrated at the shrine of St. Saviour's, on the second—at that of St. Richarius, and on the third—at that of the Virgin Mary.[270] The same order applied on days of penance prescribed in the case of some calamity.[271] Among these shrines, the highest-ranked was, of course, that of St. Saviour. This was the place where mass was celebrated on the biggest Christological feasts: Christmas, Palm Sunday, Holy Saturday, Easter Sunday as well as Ascension.[272] The shrine of St. Richarius, on the other hand, was the place where services were held on—to put it imprecisely—ordinary liturgical days. This was where mass was celebrated and office was said on the feasts of saints who did not

---

Francastel (Paris: Sevpen, 1963); Edgar Lehmann, "Die Anordnung der Altäre in der karolingischen Klosterkirche zu Centula," in *Karl der Grosse*, vol. 3, 3rd edition, ed. Wolfgang Braunfels and Hermann Schnitzler (Düsseldorf: Schwann, 1965), 374–383; Möbius, *Westwerkstudien*, passim; Andrzej Tomaszewski, *Romańskie kościoły z emporami zachodnimi na obszarze Polski, Czech i Węgier*, Studia z historii sztuki 19 (Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 1974), 361–368; Heitz, *L'Architecture religieuse carolingienne*, 51–62; idem, "Saint-Riquier en 800," *Revue du Nord* 69 (1986) no. 269: 335–344; Honore Bernard, "Saint-Riquier: une restitution nouvelle de la Basilique d'Angilbert," *Revue du Nord* 71 (1989) no. 281: 307–361.

266   Hariulf, lib. II, cap. 8, 59.
267   Hariulf, lib. II, cap. 8, 58.
268   Hariulf, lib. II, cap. 10, 67; Hariulf, Appendix VI, 296.
269   Hariulf, lib. III, cap. 3, 87.
270   Hariulf, Appendix VI, 301 f.
271   Hariulf, Appendix VI, 302 f.
272   Hariulf, Appendix VI, 297–299, 302.

have their altar or church at Centula,[273] this was also where the divine office was said—in full or in part—on some days, when mass was celebrated at the shrines of St. Saviour or the Virgin Mary.[274] The architecture of the main abbey church, too, shows that the shrines of St. Saviour and St. Richarius were places of cult that were both separate and outstanding. Despite the fact that the western shrine was located in the three-storey westwork, and the eastern shrine in the choir in the classical sense of the word, both were topped with an identical, huge, polygonal tower.[275] Incidentally, a tower also topped the Church of the Virgin Mary. One more important detail should be mentioned: at Saint-Riquier there were only three altars with a ciborium: those of St. Saviour, St. Richarius and the Virgin Mary.[276]

In addition, we know that both shrines in the main abbey church were decorated with inscriptions, among which some were definitely, others most likely composed by Angilbert. In Hariulf's times one could still read an inscription in the westwork in which the poet asked God for his grace for rulers and their subjects. In particular, he prayed for Charlemagne to be blessed and for the Lord to take mercy on anyone who would ask him for help in that church. Angilbert explains why he was authorized to make such a request: namely, he is the man who built the church. He did use the monarch's assistance in this—he readily admits that—which is why God should listen with even greater kindness to prayers for the king.[277]

In the eastern choir most inscriptions were to be found on the tomb of St. Richarius and referred to that particular saint.[278] In these inscriptions, Charlemagne is presented as the founder, as the one who built both the church and the tomb for the patron saint. While the inscription in the westwork contained a prayer for all people in fact, here only the emperor and his kingdoms are mentioned—St. Richarius was supposed to constantly intercede for him and for his state.

A chronicle commissioned by the abbot of Centula and written in the late Middle Ages provides us with an interesting piece of information: having built the new church, Charlemagne, assisted in this holy deed by Angilbert, personally elevated the body of St. Richarius, after which it was put in its new resting

---

273   Hariulf, Appendix VI, 304, 303.

274   Hariulf, Appendix VI, 298, 303.

275   See the most recent reconstruction of the edifice by Bernard, "Saint-Riquier," passim.

276   Hariulf, lib. III, cap. 3, 87; see also lib. II, cap. 10, 67.

277   Hariulf, lib. II, cap. 7, 55.

278   Hariulf, lib. II, cap. 11, 73–74.

place.[279] It is difficult to say unequivocally whether this information is true: whether the 15th-century scholar used some note which Hariulf—who writes nothing about the matter—missed, or whether we might be dealing here with amplification by a historian wanting to know more than the sources allowed.[280] Of course, should the information in question be regarded as genuine,[281] we would come across another trace of the monarch's great devotion to St. Richarius. Yet even without it, there is quite a number of details leading to an identical conclusion.

For instance, Charlemagne transforms a modest little monastery founded a long time ago by Richarius into a magnificent centre of monasticism. He makes a man close to him its abbot, raises the number of monks to three hundred and builds a monastic complex comprising several religious edifices. Moreover, he transforms the main church, housing the body of the patron, into an impressive edifice 84 metres long and, by adding the westwork, makes it an epochal achievement of architectural art. In all this he does not relegate Richarius to the role of a minor saint; on the contrary, he has one of the two main altars at Centula dedicated to him, builds a magnificent tomb for him and records his own merits in this respect in a ceremonious inscription. Not content with that, he commissions an eminent intellectual to write a *vita* and personally follows the progress of his work.

We have to agree that the greatness of the Carolingian Centula emerged on the wave of various spiritual trends which grew in importance in the second half of the 8th century. On the one hand, station liturgy was becoming increasingly important. This is one of the reasons why no fewer than three churches were built in the monastic centre in question and why the main church had designated places for commemorating the various truths of faith and for venerating various saints. On the other had, the cult of the Saviour acquired unprecedented intensity. It was from a deep desire to honour His salvific work that the concept of the westwork emerged, as an imitation of the Anastasis in Jerusalem.[282] This does not change the fact that after Christ the most important figure venerated at Centula was St. Richarius. The new spiritual trends did

---

279 *Ioannis de Capella Cronica abbreviata dominorum et sanctorum abbatum sancti Richarii*, ed. Ernest Prarond (Paris: Picard, 1893), 25–26.

280 The same sentence contains an undoubted interpolation by the late medieval chronicler. According to him, the elevation of the body of St. Richarius by Charlemagne and Angilbert was done with Pope Hadrian's consent. This is an anachronistic piece of information for the early Middle Ages.

281 This is how Möbius settles the matter, *Westwerkstudien*, 87.

282 This thesis was put forward and convincingly argued by Heitz, *Recherches*, passim.

not push him into obscurity; on the contrary—they stressed his significance even more.

The saint in question was among a large group of ascetics venerated in the Merovingian period and by no means stood out in that group. Neither with the scope of his cult, nor with his fame did he rival such figures as St. Martin of Tours or even St. Germanus of Auxerre. So the question is who St. Richarius was for Charlemagne and people around him, if such a magnificent shrine was erected around his tomb. Valuable information about the subject is provided by the *vita* of the holy confessor, a hagiographic little work written by Alcuin.[283] At Easter 800—I shall write more about this later—Charlemagne stayed at Saint-Riquier. Members of his entourage included Alcuin, whom Abbot Angilbert asked to compile a life of the patron. The Anglo-Saxon intellectual soon complied with the request (more specifically: between 801 and 804) and dedicated the work to the emperor. There is evidence in any case that the real man behind the commission was, in fact, the monarch, who followed the progress of the work on the *vita* through a messenger, and demanded that Alcuin, while editing the text, try to provide the king with spiritual sustenance.[284] The author used as his basis the life of St. Richarius written by a Merovingian hagiographer. The work, which has survived to this day,[285] did not meet the expectations of the Centula monks because of its stylistic and grammatical shortcomings.

However, Alcuin did not limit himself to linguistic corrections.[286] He preserved, except for minor changes, the order of the material found in his source, he did not add anything significant to the saint's biography, but he sharpened or altered the meaning of some of the facts given by his predecessor. In addition, he did not refrain from comments that had no equivalents in the Merovingian

---

283 *Vita Richarii II*; for more on this work, see Bruno Krusch, "Die älteste Vita Richarii," *Neues Archiv für Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde* 21 (1903), no. 1: 13–48, especially 17–19, 36–42; I Deug-Su, *L'opera hagiografica di Alcuino*, Biblioteca degli "Studi medievali" 13 (Spoleto: Presso la Sede del Centro, 1983), 115–165.

284 *Vita Richarii II*, prol., 389. As I Deug-Su writes, the *vita* was to serve as a *Fürstenspiegel* for Charlemagne (p. 376 of the article cited in the following footnote).

285 *Vita Richarii I*. For information about this source, see Krusch, "Die älteste Vita Richarii," passim; I Deug-Su, "Il 'libellus' su Ricario di Saint-Riquier. Un caso dell'agiografia merovingia nella critica moderna," *Schede medievali* 5 (1983): 359–382.

286 For more on how Alcuin reworked the earlier *vita*, see Krusch, "Die älteste Vita Richarii," 36–42. However, this very positivistically-minded scholar failed to notice the crucial problem, namely that the Anglo-Saxon intellectual understood Richarius' holiness differently from his predecessor. See also I Deug-Su, "Il 'libellus'," 365, 368–368, 375–376.

vita. All this makes the work of the Carolingian hagiographer a good reflection of the views of people who lived and worked at Charlemagne's court.

The Merovingian author begins the tale of his protagonist's life with the following event.[287] Richarius was living in Ponthieu. One day two saints—the Irishman Ficori and the Scot Caidoc—came to his land and were met with great hostility by the locals. Despite the fact that they themselves were still pagan, they accused the strangers of witchcraft, suspecting that, being demons, they caused crop failure. It was only Richarius, chosen for this by Providence, who freed the wanderers from the hands of the fools and offered shelter to the holy men. Throughout the night they explained the Word of God to their host, who, having taken it deep to his heart, confessed his sins to the holy men. From that day he lived a life focused entirely on the matters of faith and filled with most severe mortification.

This scene is also featured by Alcuin in his *vita*, but Alcuin expressed its message more emphatically, in part through comments not present in the original. The Carolingian author wanted in particular to highlight the breakthrough in the protagonist's life, which happened with the arrival of the strangers. That is why he says explicitly that Richarius was saved, because he took the travellers into his house.[288] In another fragment he notes that Richarius welcomed God in the persons of the travellers and this is why he was granted God's mercy.[289]

We can easily discern in this scene a literary motif known from the Baucis and Philemon myth or from the medieval Polish legend of Piast and Popiel. I have said elsewhere that this motif was often used in dynastic legends in the Middle Ages. However, in this case it was not used to explain why a parvenu became a king, but to explain why this particular man—a sinner living among sinners—became a saint. It is highly significant that the hagiographer used such an extraordinary literary means of expression.

---

287   *Vita Richarii I*, cap. 2–3, 445 f.

288   "Quorum [sc. rusticorum] violentiae et sceleratis praesumptionibus futurus Dei famulus Richarius obviavit Christique servos de manibus impiorum eripuit, et cum omni benignitate deducens in domum suam, Deo providente, ut isti protegerentur et ille salvaretur, obtinuit" (*Vita Richarii II*, cap. 2, 390 f.)—"The future servant of God Richarius opposed their [the peasants'] violence and the presumptions of their crimes, and snatched the servants of Christ from the hands of the impious, and with great kindness, led them to his home, by the providence of God, so that they might there be protected and he himself might be saved."

289   "[…] qui [sc. Richarius] Dominum suscepit in famulis suis hospitalitatis gratia, susceptus est a Domino misericordiae pietate" (ibid., cap. 3, 391)—"Richarius received the Lord because of his hospitality to his servants and was received with love by the Lord of mercy."

The Merovingian author regarded the milieu in which Richarius lived as pagan.[290] The people may have even been baptized,[291] but, like the relatives of the future saint,[292] did not believe in God.[293] Alcuin describes the milieu differently: the people were not pagans but peasants (*rustici et populares*),[294] while Richarius himself came from a modest family.[295] It seems that the Carolingian writer shared the common medieval belief that people of lower classes were evil by nature and not prone to piety.[296] It would, therefore, seem that in order to explain his protagonist's sainthood, the author had to demonstrate his uniqueness: the saint must have been extraordinarily good, if, having grown on such a poor soil, he was the only person who was kind to the strangers. God's grace, too, must have been great, if the Lord, by sending his emissaries to Ponthieu, gave Richarius such an extraordinary chance of conversion. Finally, the man in question must have been of exceptional merit, if he saved and took in the holy strangers, who were God's emissaries.[297] As we can see, the Baucis and Philemon myth provided hagiographers with an opportunity to convince their readers that the hero, despite his background, was indeed a saint.[298]

What comes to the fore in the description of Richarius, as presented by the Merovingian author, are ascetic values and charitable works. The hagiographer does state, of course, that his protagonist was a priest and his role as a minister is undoubtedly enhanced in the story, though it does not dominate the entire picture. Not so in Alcuin's case: Alcuin is more emphatic than his predecessor,

---

290   Cf. however Krusch's remark, "Die älteste Vita Richarii," 43. Krusch admits that the author may have meant not the people of Ponthieu but "pontearii," *Fährmänner*.

291   Such a conclusion can be drawn from the fact that when writing about the conversion of the saint, the hagiographer does not mention his baptism but only confession of sins (*Vita Richarii I*, cap. 2–3, 445).

292   *Vita Richarii I*, cap. 4, 446.

293   *Vita Richarii I*, cap. 2, 445.

294   *Vita Richarii II*, cap. 2, 390.

295   *Vita Richarii II*, cap. 1, 390. This detail is in fact taken over from the Merovingian version, *Vita Richarii I*, cap. 4, 446.

296   Roman Michałowski, "Świadomość społeczna saskiej grupy rządzącej w wiekach X–XI. Nobilis, dives, pauper—próba analizy semantycznej," *Studia Źródłoznawcze* 19 (1974): 13–27.

297   For more on the problem of grace and merit in Carolingian hagiography, see Henri Platelle, "Le Thème de la conversion à travers les oeuvres hagiographiques d'Hucbald de Saint-Amand," *Revue du Nord* 69 (1986), no. 269: 511–529.

298   Significantly, the person commissioning *Vita II*, Angilbert, preferred to believe instead that the saint had been born in an aristocratic family. The inscription placed on Richarius' tomb says clearly that he came from a noble family and that, by abandoning the affairs of this world, he renounced all riches and worldly honours (Hariulf, lib. II, cap. 11, 73).

when writing about the preaching efforts and successes of the man of God, and returns to this issue more frequently. In order to become aware of this shift of focus, let us compare several parallel fragments in both *vitae*.

The Merovingian author, when writing about the blessed fruits of the visit by the extraordinary travellers, stresses that from that moment on Richarius subjected himself to most severe mortification.[299] The Carolingian hagiographer takes up this idea, though he immediately notes that the aim of this practice was to prevent anyone from accusing the preacher of Christ of anything improper.[300] Both works mention the saint's journey to England. According to the older author, the purpose of the journey was to ransom slaves, although the hagiographer mentions that Richarius preached the Word of God in that country to whomever he could.[301] Alcuin reverses the proportions. There were two tasks—he says—the saint set for himself when going to Britain: on the one hand, he wanted to bring people the light of truth, and on the other— he wanted to free slaves, with the emphasis being put on the first task.[302] The Merovingian hagiographer attaches much weight to the fact that Richarius did many merciful deeds. The Carolingian author readily agrees with that, but he immediately asserts that the saint not only fed the hungry with earthly food but also provided them with spiritual nourishment.[303]

It is worth noting the following interpolation. The Merovingian *vita* mentions a visit paid by King Dagobert to Richarius. The man of God prayed for the monarch and then taught him a stern moral lesson, disregarding the fact that he was dealing with a ruler, not a common man.[304] Alcuin repeats the anecdote, but at the same time introduces a new element into it. Richarius drew Dagobert's attention to the fact that as a ruler he would be responsible before God not only for his own sins but also for the sins of his subjects.[305] The words seem to contain a demand that the king take care of the salvation of his nation. Thus the saint appeared as a higher-level pastor of sorts—a pastor who takes care of the good of the souls, prompting the monarch to act. The Anglo-Saxon hagiographer expressed his opinion about the holiness of his protagonist most emphatically in the following fragment. Richarius—he says—sought salvation not only for himself but also for many other people.

---

299   *Vita Richarii I*, cap. 3, 445 f.

300   *Vita Richarii II*, cap. 3, 391.

301   *Vita Richarii I*, cap. 7, 448.

302   *Vita Richarii II*, cap. 8, 393.

303   *Vita Richarii II*, cap. 6, 392.

304   *Vita Richarii I*, cap. 6, 447.

305   *Vita Richarii II*, cap. 11, 395.

And that is why he should be praised as a redeemer of many.[306] Of course, the author immediately explains that the saint carried out the work of redemption by the power of Christ, yet the word "redemptor" is used in the text with reference to Richarius. It is worth noting that this fragment has no equivalent in the earlier *vita*.

The pastoral stylization of the hero's hagiographic image introduced by the Anglo-Saxon author, especially the interpolation of the pastoral duties of the king, perfectly corresponded to the author's views and to the atmosphere of the royal court at the time. After all, it was during the reign of Charlemagne that the monarch's responsibility for the salvation of his people became an ideological and political postulate of prime importance,[307] and the intellectuals and statesmen seeking to effect this imperative included Alcuin.[308] It is worth bearing in mind here that he was probably the author of the *Admonitio generalis* capitulary.[309] According to the edict, the monarch, following the example of the ancient kings of Israel, had the duty to care for the salvation of his subjects.[310] Interestingly, the capitulary in question was issued in 789, that is, at a time when Angilbert was becoming abbot at Centula and when the renovation of the abbey was starting.

Charlemagne's veneration for Richarius—with all its consequences for Centula—may have stemmed from the pastoral nature of Richarius' sainthood. When looking for a patron for his monarchic activity, the king turned

---

306   "[…] qui [sc. Richarius] non suam tantum, sed multorum quaesivit salutem. Ideo iustum est, ut multorum ore in Christo laudetur multorum per Christum redemptor; cuius non tanti est miracula narrare quae ab eo gesta sunt, quanti miraculorum cognoscere virtutem, qua caelesti regi in diebus suis multum adquisivit populum" (*Vita Richarii II*, cap. 9, 394)—"He sought not just his own salvation, but the salvation of many people. Therefore it is right that the redeemer of many through Christ should be praised by the mouths of many. It is not so much that the miracles he enacted should be narrated, as that the force of those miracles should be recognised, by which he acquired in his day a great populace for the celestial king."

307   An overview of the problem has recently been presented by A. Angenendt, "Karl der Grosse als rex et sacerdos," in *Das Frankfurter Konzil von 794: Kristallisationspunkt karolingischer Kultur*, ed. Rainer Berndt, vol. 1: *Politik und Kirche*, Mainz: Selbstverlag der Gesellschaft für Mittelrheinische Kirchengeschichte, 1997, 255–278, especially from 270.

308   From among many works dealing with Alcuin's political views, let me cite just one: I Deug-Su, *Cultura e ideologia nella prima età carolingia*, Istituto Storico Italiano per il Medio Evo. Studi storici 146–147 (Rome: Nella sede dell'Istituto, 1984).

309   Friedrich-Carl Schiebe, Alcuin und die Admonitio generalis, *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters* 14 (1958): 221–229.

310   *Admonitio generalis*, in *Capitularia regum Francorum*, vol. 1, ed. A. Boretius MGH Legum sectio 2 (Hanover: Hahn, 1883), no. 22, 55–62.

to a priest in whom pastoral virtues were more prominent than in many other Gallic-Roman and Merovingian ascetics.

In 800, Charlemagne spent Easter at Saint-Riquier, at the tomb of the saint.[311] If it is true that the ruler personally took part in the translation of his body, the event in question must have occurred during his stay there.[312] At that time the king was touring the western part of his empire and visited great centres of cult, like St. Martin's shrine at Tours. Historians willingly agree that the aim of the journey was to secure the coastline against a Norman invasion, which seemed necessary given Charlemagne's planned autumn journey to Rome to obtain the imperial crown. A question arises however: was it not perhaps also a pilgrimage undertaken in order to ensure the blessing of great patrons of the kingdom for Charlemagne's coronation plans?[313] If this was indeed the case, the monarch counted Richarius among them. This holy priest was to watch from heaven, making sure that Charlemagne would put the imperial crown on his head and that he would lead the nations he ruled to eternal life, to an even greater benefit of the Church.

Having established what Centula was and what place Richarius occupied in it, we can now analyze the problem that is of direct interest to us.

I have already written that the mortal remains of the holy man were buried in the main church. They were kept in two locations: in the tomb situated in the eastern choir and in an altar dedicated to the saint.[314] The altar was situated between the tomb and the wall closing the choir.[315] However, the relics of St. Richarius were not the only ones that Centula kept during Charlemagne's reign. On the contrary, the monastery had a beautiful relic collection, of which we learn from an extensive fragment of Angilbert's work.[316]

In order to collect as many remains as possible, the abbot would bring them from various parts of the world: Rome, Germania, Aquitaine, Burgundy, Gaul and even Jerusalem and Constantinople. In this he used the help of many venerable individuals, such as Popes Hadrian and Leo, and, above all, Charlemagne

---

311   *Annales regni Francorum*, ed. Friedrich Kurze, MGH SS rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum (Hanover: Hahn, 1895), 110.

312   Möbius, *Westwerkstudien*, 87.

313   See Peter Classen, *Karl der Grosse, das Papsttum und Byzanz. Die Begründung des karolingischen Kaisertums*, 2nd edition, ed. Horst Fuhrmann and Claudia Märtl, Beiträge zur Geschichte und Quellenkunde des Mittelalters 9 (Sigmaringen: Thorbecke, 1988), 56–57.

314   Hariulf, lib. II, cap. 8, 59.

315   Hariulf, lib. II, cap. 7, 54.

316   Hariulf, lib. II, cap. 8, 59–67.

himself.[317] The author notes that the monarch gave Centula a particle from each relic kept in the royal treasury. Thus the abbey collection included relics of the Saviour (a piece of the Holy Cross and many others); the Virgin Mary; all the Apostles, including St. Peter; great martyrs, for example Stephen, Lawrence, Maurice and Denis; as well as Popes Linus, Cletus and Clement; famous confessors, including Martin, Augustine, Benedict and Gregory; and, finally, virgins, among whom we should mention Felicitas, Perpetua, Agatha and Scholastica.

Some of the holy objects were placed in twenty-seven altars built in three churches in accordance with the principle whereby the remains were linked to the person or mystery to which a given altar was dedicated. As a rule, the remains were accompanied by relics of other saints. For example, the altar of St. Saviour had not only Christological relics but also mortal remains of the Holy Innocents, and the altar of St. Richarius had not only the saint's remains but also relics of the Virgin May.

In Angilbert's eyes of particular importance were those holy objects that were placed not in the altars but in reliquaries. According to the information provided by the author, some relics were placed in the *capsa maior*, while the rest—in thirteen *capsae minores*. The *capsa maior* was placed in the westwork, in its lower storey, that is, on the ground floor.[318] It was located under the altar of St. Saviour, which, as we remember, was built on the first floor. The *capsae minores*, on the other hand, were placed on a golden beam, fixed in front of the altar of St. Richarius.[319]

---

317   On Charlemagne as a worshipper and collector of relics, see Heinrich Schieffers, *Karls des Grossen Reliquienschatz und die Anfänge der Aachenfahrt*, Veröffentlichungen des Bischöflichen Diözesanarchivs Aachen 10 (Aachen, 1951); Hubert Mordek, "Von Patrick zu Bonifatius … Alkuin, Ferrières und die irischen Heiligen in einem westfränkischen Reliquienverzeichnis," in *Ex ipsis rerum documentis. Festschrift Harald Zimmermann*, ed. Klaus Herbers, Hans-Henning Kortüm, and Carlo Servatius (Sigmaringen: Thorbecke, 1991), 55–68.

318   This is where the reliquary is usually located. Only Lehmann was inclined to believe that the *capsa maior* stood on the western edge of the nave ("Die Anordnung der Altäre," 382).

319   Let me quote here the relevant fragment of the source within a larger context. After listing all the relics he has managed to collect, Angilbert says: "His ita, sicut paulo superius scriptum est, in nomine sanctę TRINITATIS, cum multa diligentia preparavimus capsam maiorem auro et gemmis ornatam, in qua posuimus partem supradictarum raliquiarum, quam cum ipsis, ob venerationem illorum sanctorum quorum reliquie in ea recondi videbantur, subtus criptam sancti Salvatoris ponere studuimus. Nam ceterorum sanctorum reliquias, que supra leguntur conscriptę, per alias XIII capsas minores auro argentoque vel gemmis preciosis honestissime paratas, quas a sepe dictis venerabilibus patribus cum eisdem reliquiis, donante Domino, adipisci meruimus, dividere, atque super trabem, quam in arcu coram altare beati RICHARII statuimus, ponere curavimus, qualiter in omnibus

The abbot explains why the relics were laid out in this manner. The idea was to make it possible to venerate the Lord and all the saints in an appropriate manner throughout the church. Thus it turns out that true veneration of God was possible only when he was worshipped in the presence of relics. Those placed in altarstones were not enough. As we can guess—this was because they belonged to a small and not very representative number of saints; it may have been also because the particles were too small. Yet not sufficient either were those remains that were placed in the *capsa maior*, because they were in the shrine of St. Saviour. Thus, in order for the prayer offered in St. Richarius' shrine to be fruitful, reliquaries had to be placed there as well.

From our point of view the most important factor is the following: Centula was the centre of the cult of St. Richarius—a cult dear to the ruling class at the time, especially to Charlemagne himself. This does not mean, however, that the presence of the patron's tomb fully satisfied the religious needs of the faithful. He was just one saint, whereas the true cult of God required a number of saints. That is why the main abbey church was filled with relics. However, they did not replace Richarius' body, nor did they push him into obscurity. In the eastern shrine, veneration continued to be focused on the mortal remains of the patron, a fact manifested in the spatial layout of the reliquaries. These thirteen capsules were placed in front of the altar of St. Richarius, with the saint's tomb behind them. On either side of the latter were two other tombs, both decorated with inscriptions by Angilbert himself. They were the resting places of Ficori and Caidoc, those men of God through whom Richarius had experienced his conversion.[320] As a result, his mortal remains were laid to rest

---

locis, sicut dignum est, laus dei et veneratio omnium sanctorum ejus, in hoc sancto loco semper adoretur, colatur atque veneretur" (Hariulf, lib. II, cap. 9, 66 f.)—"For these, as was written just above, in the name of the holy trinity we very lovingly prepared a large repository adorned with gold and gemstones, in which we placed some of the relics mentioned above. We took care to place it along with the relics under the crypt of the holy Saviour for the veneration of those saints whose relics are preserved within it. We exerted ourselves to divide up the relics of the other saints about whom you may read above, and placed them in thirteen other smaller repositories most nobly made with gold, silver or precious stones, above the beam which we installed in the arch before the altar of Saint Richarius. The praise of God and the veneration of all his saints may thus in this blessed place always be celebrated, cultivated, and venerated, as it is fitting that it should be done in all places." Heitz (*L'Architecture religieuse carolingienne*, 58) claims that twelve of the reliquaries contain remains of the Apostles, while the thirteenth—the relics of St. Richarius. I do not know where the author got his information from.

320   Hariulf, lib. II, cap. 11, 75–76.

surrounded on three sides by relics of other saints. I should also add that the eastern shrine, at least a part of it, was called *Thronus sancti Richarii*.[321]

To the two main examples on which my argument is based I will now add another one, analyzing it in less detail. The example is that of the Santa Sofia Church in Benevento. The church was founded by Arechis II (d. 787), a prince who ruled the Lombards living in the southern part of the Apennine Peninsula. The prince had great ambitions and expressed them not only in his political activity, but also in the religious and symbolic sphere. The purpose of his intense religious activity was to demonstrate that he was the true ruler of the Lombards, worthy of replacing the king who had reigned in Pavia until 774. There was another purpose as well: Arechis tried to ensure Divine grace for his people. What comes to the fore among his symbolic-religious ventures is the foundation of Santa Sofia, which was to be a copy of Justinian's church in Constantinople.[322]

Arechis spared no effort in order for the church he had founded to have mortal remains of many saints. Unfortunately, in this case we do not have at our disposal such a valuable collection of sources as in the case of Saint-Germain d'Auxerre and Centula. Although several works describing translations of relics to Benevento during Arechis's times have survived, the texts, which in any case cannot be precisely dated, certainly were not written—with the exception of perhaps one[323]—during the reign of the monarch in question.[324] We cannot, therefore, be sure whether the interpretations of facts suggested by the authors truly reflect the views of people who brought the relics to Benevento and placed them at Santa Sofia. It would be safer to assume that the sources we have at our disposal reflect the awareness of later, though perhaps not very distant generations.

---

321   Hariulf, Appendix VI, 298. This term, confirmed by Angilbert himself, survived the Carolingian period. For more on this, see Lehmann, *Die Anordnung der Altäre*, 380–381.

322   For more on Arechis II and his foundation, see Michałowski, *Princeps fundator*, 29–32; ibid. also earlier literature on the subject. Among more recent works, see Vuolo, *Agiografia beneventana*, 202–217 and its bibliography.

323   A short account in verse traditionally, though probably unjustifiably, attributed to Paul the Deacon (PL vol. 95, col. 1600).

324   For more on translations of relics by Arechis II and on hagiographic works describing these events, see Belting, *Studien zum beneventanischen Hof*, 156–160; Vuolo, *Agiografia beneventana*, loc. cit. See also works by Hipployte Delehaye and Stéphane Binon cited in footnote 332.

Of interest to us are four works in particular: *Translatio duodecim Martyrum*, a work in verse,[325] and *Translatio sancti Mercurii*, which has three versions: two in prose[326] and one in verse.[327] We learn from the first piece that Prince Arechis brought the bodies of the Twelve Martyrs from Apulia and buried them at Santa Sofia, all in one altar. As a result, Benevento acquired powerful patrons and the monarch obtained a guarantee of eternal life.[328]

After the mortal remains of the Twelve Martyrs had been buried there, the monarch brought to his capital the body of St. Mercurius. The BHL 5937 Translation provides the following account of the event. (Translations BHL 5936 and 5938 provide a similar description, differing only in some details.) The relics of St. Mercurius were found in a town fifteen miles away from Benevento; they were elevated and then brought to the capital. However, before the procession reached the city walls, the cart on which the relics were placed, stopped and despite repeated efforts it could neither be pushed nor pulled. Arechis, afraid that he would lose such a valuable treasure, took off his princely robes, put on a hair shirt and offered precious gifts to the saint. In addition, he gave him keys to the city, promised that he would pay an annual tribute and proclaimed himself and his people servant (*servus*) of the martyr. He did so hoping that the saint would agree to come to Benevento and that he would care for and defend the entire province. Yet the cart still would not move. The prince then promised that the altar in which the martyr's relics would be placed would be more important than other altars, that it would be two steps higher than them, and that on Sundays and on great feast days divine service would be celebrated there.[329] When Arechis made this promise,

---

325   *Translatio duodecim Martyrum* [BHL 2300], ed. Georg Waitz, MGH SS rerum Langobardicarum et Italicarum (Hanover: Hahn, 1878), 574–576.

326   *Translatio sancti Mercurii* [BHL 5936], ed. Georg Waitz, MGH Scriptores rerum Langobardicarum, 576–578; Historia corporis sancti Mercurii, Caesarea delati Quintodecimum, et inde Beneventum [BHL 5937], in Edmond Martène and Ursin Durand, *Veterum scriptorum et monumentorum historicorum, dogmaticorum, moralium, amplissima collectio*, vol. 6 (Paris: Montalant, 1729), col. 751–756.

327   BHL 5938, MGH Scriptores rerum Langobardicarum, 578–580.

328   *Translatio duodecim Martyrum*, passim.

329   "Tunc Christianissimus princeps [Arechis] vehementius dolens, se quasi ad oram littori naufragari cum opibus acquisitis, exuit se insignia principatus, et vestem induit cilicinam, quae moeste mentis insinuaret affectum, atque coram corpore venerando excellentiam suae dignitatis humilians, obtulit beato Mercurio dona non pauca, ditia satis erga martyrem devotionis indicia. Claves vero portarum totius civitatis cum annuis tributis illi in eodem loco obtulit, seque servum eius cum omni vulgo attestans, ut moveri dignaretur et ad locum praefatae aulae digne sibit paratum veniret, essetque totius provinciae tutor

the relics allowed themselves to be brought to the metropolis without any
further resistance.

It is also worth examining the BHL 5936 Translation. Its author ends his
account in the following manner: "Itaque miles Christi Mercurius ad sancte
Sophie basilicam deportatur, in qua duodecim fratrum senatus requiescit egre-
gius aliorumque utriusque ordinis corpora beatorum, eorumque non impar
et busti dignioris ante sanctorum aram duodecim fratrum et ceterorum, ut
ita dixerim dominii eiusdem loci tutor et urbis, disponente Domino, meruit
principatum. Reconditum est autem corpus beati Mercurii in basilica sancte
Sophie intra menia Beneventi septimo Kalendis Septembris, anno vero ab
incarnatione domini nostri Iesu Christi septingentesimo sexagesimo octavo,
ad tutelam urbis et honorem et gloriam eiusdem domini nostri Iesu Christi
[…].[330] Thus, we learn that the remains of both Mercurius and the Twelve
Martyrs were placed at Santa Sofia. Mercurius' relics were put in a tomb (the

---

atque defensor. Cum autem birotum adhuc perduraret immobile, promissionibus auxit
promissiones: dicens quod ara ubi martyr ipse se in membris suis concederet collocan-
dum, altaribus ceteris principalior haberetur; itaque duobus gradibus emineret, ac diebus
dominicis in solemniis quoque praecipuis in eadem ara sacra deberet ministeria cele-
brari" (*Historia corporis sancti Mercurii*, col. 755 C–E)—"Then the most Christian ruler
[Arichis], greatly afflicted, as though he were about to be shipwrecked on the shore with
all his acquired riches, removed the signs of his rule and dressed himself in a hair-shirt
that would demonstrate that he was mournful in spirit. He abased his excellence before
the venerable body and offered great gifts to Saint Mercurius, sufficiently lavish signs of
devotion towards the blessed martyr. He offered him [Saint Mercurius] the keys to the
gates of the whole city and an annual tribute in the same place, and swore that he and
the whole populace would be servants of the saint, if he [Saint Mercurius] would conde-
scend to be moved and come to the place prepared for and worthy of him in the afore-
mentioned hall; he [Saint Mercurius] would then also be the guardian and defender of
the whole province. When, however, the carriage remained immobile, he added promises
to promises. He said that the altar where the martyr himself had conceded his limbs could
be placed would be superior to the other altars: it would be raised two steps above them,
and on Sundays and and special feast days the ministry would be performed in the same
sacred altar."

330   *Translatio sancti Mercurii* [BHL 5936], cap. 4, 578 ("And thus Mercurius, the soldier of
Christ, is carried to the basilica of Saint Sophia where the eminent man rests with the
twelve brothers of the senate and the bodies of other saints of each order. He is not
unequal to them or unfitting for a more worthy tomb before the altar of the twelve broth-
ers and others; if I may put it this way, the guardian of that place and that city, with God's
grace, deserved the first place at the banquet. Indeed, the body of Saint Mercurius was
buried in the basilica of Saint Sophia within the Beneventan walls on the 26th of August,
in the year of the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ 768, for the protection of the city
and the glory and honour of our Lord Jesus Christ").

hagiographer must have certainly meant the altar)[331] that was more worthy than others and located in front of the altar in which the bodies of the Twelve Martyrs were buried. The author then states that Mercurius deserved to be the leader of the other saints whose bodies were buried in the shrine. He also adds that his primacy stemmed from the fact that he was a defender of the church and of the city.

In order to explain the privileged position of their protagonist, the authors of the *Translations* of St. Mercurius used a common hagiographic topos. They presented a scene in which the cart carrying the relics stopped and nothing could move it. The topos was used in most cases in order to prove that a given saint really wanted to be buried in the city or church in which he eventually found himself. The motif serves such a function in our case, too, but it also plays another role: it enables the readers to understand that Mercurius' privileged position among other saints stemmed from the privileges and claims to glory bestowed on the martyr by Arechis, who was afraid that otherwise the relics would not reach the Santa Sofia church. The monarch concluded that the saint was both the defender and the lord of Benevento—lord of its ruler and its people. Moreover, he assigned to the martyr the noblest resting place and the highest ranked altar.

Essentially, we are dealing here with a situation similar to the one we encountered at Saint-Germain d'Auxerre and Centula. The Santa Sofia church, too, had relics of many saints, but the cult was focused on one of them, St. Mercurius.[332] He was regarded as the lord and special protector of the city and the church, and, consequently,[333] had the right to a more worthy altar

---

331   See the quote in footnote 328.

332   For more on the cult of St. Mercurius in early medieval Benevento, see Hipployte Delehaye, "La Translatio sancti Mercurii Beneventum" (1st ed. 1908), in idem, *Mélanges d'hagiographie grecque et latine*, Subsidia hagiographica 48 (Brusseles: Société des Bollandistes, 1966), 189–195; Stéphane Binon, *Essai sur le cycle de saint Mercure, Martyr de Dèce et meurtrier de l'Empereur Julien*, Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Hautes Etudes, Sciences religieuses 53 (Paris: Leroux, 1937), 42–53, 99–100; Vuolo, *Agiografia beneventana*, 209–213.

333   There was a logical link between the role which Mercurius was to play with regard to the body politic, and the privileged nature of his resting place. The martyr received a privileged altar, because he was the ruler of Benevento and its guardian. This is clearly stated by the author of the BHL 5937 Translation: "Ad ejus [Mercurii] namque nomen et decus in aula ejusdem sanctae Sophiae ante altare duodecim germanorum, juxta quod princeps voverat in Domino memoratus, constructa est ara praestantior, privilegiata in celebrationibus divinorum, et profecto rationabiliter et decenter: beatus nempe Mercurius, qui arte strenuus militari propter victoriam gloriosam, quam de copiis barbarorum affatus angelicus est indeptus, Romani exercitus creatus est princeps, merito ad tutelam Longobardi

than other saints, an altar that was at the same time his eternal resting place. The author of Translation BHL 5936 even coined an unusual term: he wrote about the primacy (*principatus*) of the martyr over other saints whose bodies were buried in the same shrine. Yet some of those other saints, too, served as patrons of Benevento—we know that from the Translation of the Twelve Martyrs quoted above.

The examples discussed here make it possible to put our knowledge of the cult of relics in the early Middle Ages in order and expand it somewhat. We know very well that at that time there were shrines of local, national or European significance, shrines that were centres of the cult of great confessors or martyrs. The direct object of cult was the body of the saint entombed in a given shrine. Such cases occurred quite often; suffice it to mention St. Peter's Basilica in Rome or the Saint-Denis Abbey near Paris. On the other hand, there were frequent attempts to create treasuries of relics of many saints in various churches. Examples include the collection of remains which in the 8th century was held in the female monastery at Chelles[334] or the collection of oils from the tombs of Roman martyrs, encompassing over seventy items, given around 600 to the Lombard queen Theodelinda and placed at St. John's in Monza.[335] One of the reasons why these treasuries were amassed was the conviction that a truly fruitful contact with God was possible only through relics personifying many saints. This issue has been raised in the literature on the subject many times.[336]

The material presented above makes it possible to distinguish another variant, hitherto not discussed by historians and, in fact, not recognized.[337] Some

---

tituli procurandam, obtinet Samniae principatum" (*Historia corporis sancti Mercurii*, col. 756 CD)—"For the name and glory of Saint Mercurius a more prominent altar was made in the hall of the same church of Saint Sophia, in front of the altar of the twelve brothers, just as the ruler, mindful of the Lord, had vowed. This altar was privileged in the rites of divine worship, and indeed this is fitting and reasonable. For truly Saint Mercurius, who was made leader of the Roman army, was vigorous in fighting for the glorious victory that he obtained over the barbarian hordes, having spoken as an angel; he deservedly obtains the rule over Samnia for attending to the guarding of Lombard reputation."

334   D. Ganz and W. Goffart, "Charters earlier than 800 from French Collections," *Speculum* 65 (1990): 928–932.

335   *Die nicht literarischen lateinischen Papiry Italiens aus der Zeit 445–700*, ed. Jan Olof Tjäder, vol. 2 (Lund and Stockholm: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1982), no. 50, 216–222.

336   See e.g. Jean-Claude Schmitt, "Les reliques et les images," in *Les reliques. Objets, cultes, symboles*, 150–151.

337   An exception is a paper by Hilde Claussen, "Eine Reliquiennische in der Krypta auf dem Petersberg bei Fulda," *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 21 (1987): 245–272.

shrines dedicated to the cult of an eminent saint spared no effort or expense to collect the mortal remains of many other martyrs and confessors. As a result, there emerged substantial treasuries of relics, which constituted a certain religious whole together with the body of the main patron. This whole was manifested in, for example, the fact that all the relics, including the remains of the patron, were kept in one place within the church, for instance in the choir or in the same crypt. The compilation of such collections was motivated by a desire to experience the mystical presence of all the saints. We have to say very clearly that this was in no way connected to a degradation of the "main" saint, that this was neither its manifestation, nor its consequence. On the contrary, it surrounded him with even greater splendour. These "additional" relics were placed around the body of the patron so that it was clearly in the middle. No one could be in any doubt as to who was the central object of cult. On the other hand, theological reflection accompanying the compilation of a new religious whole led to the conviction that it was the patron in question with his prayers and merits that brought the mortal remains of other saints to his shrine. The creation of a hierarchical treasury of relics may have also been a reverse process. At some point a shrine which already had some relics would acquire the body of a saint who from that moment would become the main object of adoration.

It is no coincidence that shrines with such a complex structure were created at Centula or Auxerre. This is not even about the fact that these monasteries took advantage, to a large extent, of favours bestowed by the high and mighty of this world, without which they would not have been able to build up such rich collections of relics. But in both cases the treasuries were also based on the tombs of great saints. After all, thirteen reliquaries were placed in the choir at Centula only because St. Richarius' altar and his tomb were located there. This was a place from which sprang an extraordinarily rich source of grace and for this reason it could become a shrine ensuring sacred wholeness. However, in order to achieve this aim, remains of many other saints had to placed by the tomb of the patron. Similarly, at Auxerre the placing of the relics of many martyrs and confessors in the crypt made sense only because the body of St. Germanus was buried there. Only thanks to the presence of the latter was the place a particularly rich source of God's grace.

The material concerning the shrines of the type that is of interest to us has not been researched in detail yet, so it is not easy to say how frequent the phenomenon occurred in the early Middle Ages and what its geography and chronology looked like. That the shrines were already founded in the Carolingian period is well known. Let us just note that in addition to the familiar monasteries at Centula and Auxerre, there were also two Fulda churches:

the abbey church with the body of St. Boniface as the main object of cult and the church at Petersberg in which a similar role was played by St. Lioba.[338]

The Ottonian period has not been researched in this respect at all. We know of course that there were times in which relics we collected zealously, with no effort or expense spared, in Flanders, in Lorraine and in areas east of the Rhine.[339] The mortal remains of saints were brought mainly from Italy— *La grande rapina dei corpi santi* was the title of an article dealing with the subject.[340] But relics were also obtained in areas located north of the Alps.

The greatest contribution to the collecting of relics was made by bishops. It would not be difficult to list the names of princes of the imperial Church, such as Bruno of Cologne, St. Udalric of Augsburg, Egbert of Trier, Theodoric II of Metz, Gerard of Toul or Bernward of Hildesheim, who spared no effort in enriching their dioceses, especially by acquiring bodies of saints, even more often their fragments, for the chapels and monasteries they had founded. Abbots—who did not play a leading role in the imperial Church—had more limited possibilities, but even in this respect many of them, e.g. St. Gerard of Brogne, were highly successful. It is worth bearing in mind that in the Lorraine monastic reform movement, it was very important for an abbey to be in possession of the body of a great saint. The belief was that this was a prerequisite for spiritual development of its monastic community.

We know that in some cases there emerged impressive collections of relics. For instance, Bernward of Hildesheim donated holy remains to various churches in his episcopal see, that is, to the cathedral, the Holy Cross chapel and, first of all, the Monastery of St. Michael founded by him. There, in addition to remains placed in altars and capitals of columns, he put sixty-six holy

---

338   Ibid., passim.

339   Eugenio Dupré Theseider, "La 'grande rapina dei corpi santi' dall'Italia al tempo di Ottone I," in *Festschrift Percy Ernst Schramm*, ed. Peter Classen and Peter Scheibert, vol. 1 (Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1964), 420–432; Daniel Misonne, "Gérard de Brogne et sa dévotion aux reliques," *Sacris erudiri* 25 (1982): 1–26; Dieter von der Nahmer, "Die Inschrift auf der Bernwardstür in Hildesheim im Rahmen Bernwardinischer Texte," in *Bernwardinische Kunst*, ed. Martin Gosebruch Gosebruch and Frank Neidhart Steigerwald (Göttingen: E. Goltze, 1988), 56–57; Robert Folz, "Un évêque ottonien: Thierry Ier de Metz (965–984)," in *Media in Francia … Recueil de Mélanges offert à Karl Ferdinand Werner* (Paris: Hérault, 1989), 142 ff.; Anne Wagner, "Collection de reliques et pouvoir épiscopal au Xe siècle. L'exemple de l'évêque Thierry Ier de Metz," *Revue d'Histoire de l'Eglise de France* 83 (1997): 317–341; Edina Bozóki, "La Politique des reliques des premiers comtes de Flandre (fin du IXe—fin du XIe siècle)," in *Les Reliques. Objets, cultes, symboles*, 271–292.

340   See the previous footnote.

particles in the crypt. He chose a spot in the same crypt—in front of the altar of the Virgin Mary—to be the place of his own interment. There seems to be no doubt that the collection of the holy remains kept there was to ensure—through the saints made manifest by them—succour for the bishop on Doomsday.[341] This was simply an *ad sanctos* burial. We are dealing here with a collection of remains treated as a certain sacred whole, compiled for a specific purpose, that is, the achievement of eternal life.

However, is it possible to distinguish among the relic treasuries of the Ottonian princes of the Church those that would be of the type we know from Auxerre, Centula and Benevento? As I have said, there are no studies dealing with the subject. It seems that from this point of view, we should look, first of all, at the work of Wikfrid, Bishop of Verdun. In 971 he founded a monastery on the tomb of St. Paul the Confessor—his predecessor in the episcopal see—dedicated it to him and placed there numerous relics brought from Italy and other countries.[342] Thus, we would be dealing here with a situation in which the central object of cult would be one saint surrounded, however, by a multitude of martyrs and confessors.

Some kings and lay princes, too, were interested in relics and did all they could to obtain them and bring them to their homeland or to place those that were already there in monasteries and churches that belonged to them. Those that come to the fore among these rulers are Counts of Flanders, above all Arnulf the Great, but also many of his successors. We can even speak of a planned and consistent policy in this respect on their part.[343]

What then, of the Ottonians? It has been suggested that Otto I did not try to obtain relics, perhaps because he thought that the treasury amassed by the Carolingians in Aachen was sufficient.[344] This view is obviously erroneous. The monarch's care for his Magdeburg foundation was manifested also in the fact that he provided it with mortal remains of saints.[345] Among them were the relics of the patron of the Empire, St. Maurice. However, we are unable to say whether the Magdeburg shrine displayed the features characteristic of Centula and Auxerre.

---

341   Von der Nahmer, "Die Inschrift auf der Bernwardstür", 56–57.

342   For information about Wikfrid of Verdun as a collector of relics, see Wagner, "Collection de reliques", 320–321.

343   Various aspects of the issue are explored by Bozóki, "La Politique des reliques," passim.

344   Dupré Theseider, "La grande rapina dei corpi santi", 424.

345   Claude, *Geschichte des Erzbistums Magdeburg*, vol. 1, according to the index (s.v. *Reliquientranslationen*).

It is time to return to the Church of St. Adalbert on the Tiber Island. The facts presented here allow us to re-evaluate Otto III's plans for the shrine. We have to remember that as he founded the church in question and placed there St. Adalbert's arm, the emperor decided to give his foundation the remains of as many saints as possible. He wanted to create a shrine on the Tiber Island that would be comparable to the Carolingian monasteries at Centula and Auxerre. Of course, we have no information about how all these relics were to have been placed in the topography of the church; we do not know what plans there were in this respect and to what extent they were implemented. What seems to be beyond doubt, however, is that the emperor's plans included the creation of a great shrine in which the centre of cult would be the body of the Apostle of the Prussians buried there, with the status of the shrine being enhanced by the remains of a whole host of martyrs, confessors and virgins. The presence of these martyrs, confessors and virgins was necessary not because Adalbert's holiness was insufficient, but because no single saint could guarantee sacred fullness. This was the fullness meant by the emperor, when he founded a church in Rome dedicated to his friend. Therefore, it is not true that Otto III did not fully believe in St. Adalbert's sacred value. On the contrary, he had a high opinion of it and that is why he decided to establish a centre of cult of the highest rank around this priceless relic.

Of course we could ask how we can know that it was Adalbert's arm and not the remains of some other saint that were to be the main relic in the treasury on the Tiber Island. The answer is simple: in the 11th century the only or the main *patrocinium* of the church was that of St. Adalbert. There is another argument worth adding as well: the church crypt, built in the Ottonian times, is decorated with capitals featuring representations of the eagle. We may be dealing here with a reference to a hagiographic legend according to which the unburied body of the martyr was guarded by the bird.[346] Such a strong iconographic motif in the crypt would refer to Adalbert and not some other martyr or confessor.

We need to be aware of the fact that the translation of the Bishop of Prague to Rome was an extraordinary event. Since late Antiquity the Eternal City had been famous as a resting place of the venerable bodies of Apostles Peter and Paul as well as innumerable martyrs. This was one of the reasons why it was regarded as a holy city and was a destination for pilgrimages from the entire Latin Europe. In addition, it was a practically inexhaustible reservoir of relics for the rest of the continent. During the reigns of the Carolingians and the Ottonians they were constantly transferred beyond the Alps and were held

---

346   This is the view of Dercks, "Die Adlerkapitelle in der Krypta," 809–812.

there in the highest veneration.[347] In this case, on the other hand, we are dealing with the opposite direction: relics are brought from beyond the Alps to Rome. A sequence written at Reichenau in early 1002 at the latest triumphantly speaks of the fact that Otto III gave the Romans St. Adalbert's arm.[348] In the emperor's view, the Bishop of Prague was not some "poor relation" of the famous martyrs from the basilicas in the Eternal City. He must have been above par, if it was worth bringing him to Rome and founding a shrine for him.

At this point I should go back to my remark that the monarch was inclined to regard Adalbert as an apostle. The material examined in the present subchapter—specifically, the thesis concerning the high rank of the shrine with the relics of the Bishop of Prague at its centre—confirms this conjecture to some extent. Let us note the following circumstances.

Rome was a city of the Apostles. The greatest of them—St. Peter and St. Paul—were buried there. On their tombs stood magnificent shrines attracting pilgrims from all over Europe. The idea to create a great centre of cult on the Tiber River dedicated to St. Adalbert could have emerged only if the Bishop of Prague was considered to be an apostle. Otherwise, the status of the shrine would have been too low for the city in which it was to be located.

And the other circumstance. Despite the fact that the sources are unclear and contradictory, we should assume that in 999 Otto III brought the body of St. Bartholomew from Benevento to the Tiber Island. Even if it is true that the people of Benevento deceived him by giving him the remains of another saint (allegedly Paulinus of Nola), the emperor lived at least for some time convinced that he had managed to obtain the relics of the Apostle.[349] In the same

---

347 For information about Carolingian times, see e.g. Klemens Honselmann, "Reliquientranslationen nach Sachsen," in *Das erste Jahrtausend*. Textband 1, 159–193; Friedrich Prinz, "Stadtrömisch-italische Märtyrerreliquien und fränkischer Reichsadel im Maas-Moselland," *Historisches Jahrbuch* 87 (1967): 1–25; Hans Reinhard Seeliger, "Einhards römische Reliquien. Zur Übertragung der Heiligen Marzellinus und Petrus ins Frankenreich," *Römische Quartalschrift für christliche Altertumskunde und Kirchengeschichte* 83 (1988): 58–75; Herbers, "Rom im Frankenreich," 133–169; idem, "Mobilität und Kommunikation in der Karolingerzeit—die Reliquienreisen der heiligen Chrysantus und Daria", in *Literatur—Geschichte—Literaturgeschichte. Beiträge zur mediävistischen Literaturwissenschaft. Festschrift für Volker Honemann zum 60. Geburtstag*, ed. Nine Miedema and Rudolf Suntrup (Franfurt am Main: Lang, 2003), 647–660 (the last item contains the latest literature on the subject). For information about Ottonian times, see the literature indicated earlier in this subchapter.

348 *Cantica Medii Aevi*, verse 9a, 13; see Maurer, "Rechtlicher Anspruch," 268–269.

349 Cecchelli, *La basilica ottoniana*, 29–33, 84–88. Whether the body of St. Bartholomew was indeed brought to Rome in the 10th century and whether this was carried out by

year or even earlier a decision was made to found a church of St. Adalbert in Rome. Thus, the translation was connected with a planned centre of cult. It turns out that a member of the College of the Twelve was to be laid to rest next to the Bishop of Prague in a church dedicated to the latter. It would be difficult to imagine in such a situation that St. Adalbert's dignity was not in some way comparable to that of St. Bartholomew.

The same conclusions emerge from an analysis of the wellhead from San Bartolomeo all'Isola. The monument in question has been the subject of disputes among scholars. The disputes concern the dating and identification of two of the four figures depicted in the wellhead.[350] I believe that the most probable opinion is one according to which the wellhead was made during the reign of Otto III or Henry II, and that the figure of bishop wearing the pallium represents Adalbert. The identification of the other saint is easy: he is undoubtedly Bartholomew. Both flank an emperor (Otto III or Henry II), serving as intermediaries between Christ (the fourth of the figures) and the monarch. Once again the Bishop of Prague is put on a par with the Apostle in some way.

There was a serious difference between a member of the College of the Twelve and a missionary from the most recent past. People in the period in question were perfectly aware of that. On the other hand—as can be seen in the controversies surrounding the status of Bishop Martial—the notion of apostolicity was very flexible. As a result, with the right dose of determination Adalbert could be regarded as an apostle in the sense in which the term was used with reference to Bartholomew. After all, both were missionaries, both were martyred while on their missions—is this not the essence of apostolicity?

5 The Meaning of the Title *Archiepiscopus sancti Adalberti*

The time has come to ask why Gaudentius is referred to as archbishop of St. Adalbert in the 999 Roman document. At that time he had already been

---

Otto III—these are questions kept being asked by historians for decades. In addition to Cecchelli's work cited here, see items listed in footnote 173.

350   For more on this historic monument, see the bibliography given in footnote 173. For the illustrations of the wellhead, see Roman Michałowski, "Adalbert, Sylvestre II et l'Eglise de Pologne," in *Gerberto d'Aurillac da Abate di Bobbio al Papa dell'Anno 1000. Atti del Congresso Internazionale Bobbio, Auditorium di* S. *Chiara, 28–30 settembre 2000*, ed. Flavio G. Nuvolone, Archivum Bobbiense. Studia, 4 (Bobbio/Pc: Assoziazione culturale Amici di Archivum Bobiense, 2001), illustration 7, 8, 10 and 11.

designated as the holder of the See of Gniezno,[351] and yet he was described not with reference to the name of the see but that of its patron. Although this sometimes happened in the early Middle Ages, it was an extremely rare occurrence.

The title *Archiepiscopus sancti Adalberti* suggests a strong conviction that there were close links between the Bishop of Prague and the Archbishopric of Gniezno which was being founded at the time. The question is what kind of links they were.[352]

As the material presented in the previous chapter teaches us, in the early Middle Ages a mission among the pagans contributed to the creation of ideological foundations of many a church province. We have had an opportunity to note that the Salzburg Church defended its status as an archbishopric, invoking the evangelizing merits of Rupert. This saint—as sceptics and opponents were told—had converted Bavaria to the Christian faith. Pilgrim's line of reasoning was similar. Passau deserved the pallium, because huge areas around the middle Danube accepted Christianity from the Bishops of Lauriacum. Adalbert, too, was a missionary of a completely pagan country; some even saw him as an apostle.

In addition, Pilgrim's forgeries show that martyrdom played a role in the ecclesiastical-political thinking concerning the ideological foundations of archbishoprics. Adalbert's martyrdom was beyond any doubt. Death from a bloody wound at the hands of pagans during a mission, a wound inflicted out of hatred for the Christian faith, met all, even the strictest criteria of this notion.

A hypothesis thus emerges: St. Adalbert was a man who won an archbishopric for himself thanks to his apostolicity and martyrdom. He himself became spiritually an archbishop, as it were. The wellhead from the San Bartolomeo

---

351 This evidenced by the fact that that in March 1000 Gaudentius was enthroned as Archbishop of Gniezno, which would have been impossible without prior decision by the Roman synod. It is also worth quoting a sentence from Cosmas's *Chronicle*: "Eodem [999] anno Gaudentius, qui et Radim, frater sancti Adalberti, ordinatus est episcopus ad titulum Gnezdensis ecclesie" (*Cosmae Pragensis Chronica Boemorum*, lib. I, cap. 34, 60). Assuming that the chronicler quotes a source from the late 10th and early 11th century, without an interpolation of his own, we would obtain an additional argument supporting our thesis. But this assumption carries a considerable risk.

352 The literature on the subject underlines the traditional significance of the death of St. Adalbert, and his relics for the establishment of the Archbishopric of Gniezno. Gerard Labuda is probably most emphatic in this, see e.g. "Spuścizna ideowa martyrium św. Wojciecha w perspektywie dziejów Polski średniowiecznej," in *Człowiek w społeczeństwie*, 76–80; there also some of the more pertinent contributions of earlier scholars.

church on the Tiber Island in Rome features an image of St. Adalbert. Interestingly, he is depicted wearing the pallium. The well comes most likely from the first quarter of the 11th century, meaning that the Roman circles in Otto III's or Henry II's times were convinced that the missionary of the Prussians, although he had not received the insignia from anyone in his lifetime,[353] nevertheless deserved it because of his mission and his death. Gniezno seemed to have taken over Adalbert's merits from him.

The same can be said of Salzburg: when defending its rights to the rank of metropolitan see, it cited Rupert's otherwise not quite genuine achievements in the Christianization of Bavaria. Pilgrim, too, when he wanted to obtain the pallium for himself and for his episcopal see, pointed to the even more mythical evangelizing successes of the Bishops of Lauriacum. However, Rupert was regarded as Bishop of Salzburg; similarly, Pilgrim saw Bishops of Lauriacum as his predecessors. If so, Rupert's merits were merits of the Bishopric of Salzburg, and the merits of the Lorch bishops became the merits of the Diocese of Passau. Therefore, there were grounds to claim that these local Churches "had worked hard" for the title of archbishopric.

There was no such connection between Adalbert and Gniezno. He was the bishop of the Bohemian capital and not the capital of Poland. How, in these circumstances, should we imagine this transfer of archiepiscopal dignity from St. Adalbert to the Gniezno see?

Let us first note that the martyr evangelized Prussians not on his own but with his brother Gaudentius, who, as we known, later held the Gniezno see. This means that the new archbishopric took over the missionary nature partly from its first archbishop. It is highly significant that in the ideological systems formulated in early medieval Churches a lot of weight was attached the cooperation of several bishops—founders of a given diocese, who succeeded each other in their office. The first three Bishops of Trier were sent together by

---

353   Gerard Labuda explains that St. Adalbert received the pallium as he set out for Prussia as a missionary (in *Święty Wojciech w polskiej tradycji*, 348). No source mentions this, but the scholar refers to the well-documented example of Bruno of Querfurt. However, there was a crucial difference between Adalbert and Bruno. The latter pursued a great missionary plan, which was ardently supported by Otto III and which was eventually accepted by Henry II. St. Adalbert, on the other hand, left the Eternal City having fallen into disfavour. There were demands for him to return to Prague. No one sent Adalbert on a mission; he was allowed only—and very reluctantly—to go to the pagans, if no one wanted to accept him in his homeland. Thus, if we were to agree with Labuda's interpretation, we would first have to prove that the apostolic mandate to convert the pagans was automatically and necessarily associated with the pallium. It is doubtful whether such proof would be possible.

St. Peter to the land on the Moselle, still completely pagan, in order to convert it: Eucharius as bishop, Valerius as deacon and Maternus as subdeacon.[354] This guaranteed that not only the first bishop but also all his successors would have a charism which was manifested at the beginning of the local Church and which was a prerequisite for its holiness. It seems that people in the entourage of Otto III, Sylvester II and perhaps also Bolesław Chrobry thought along similar lines. That is why the person of Gaudentius as the Archbishop of Gniezno simply suggested itself.[355]

There was another, just as or even more important factor. According to early medieval views, a saint imparted his dignity to the church in which his mortal remains were buried. There are many examples of this. For instance, there were claims in the 9th century in Ravenna that had it been possible to keep the body of St. Andrew there, the local bishopric would have become independent of Rome. But, unfortunately, the Byzantine emperor had the relics transferred to Constantinople.[356] The view expressed in Ravenna was based on two premises. Firstly, the assumption was that St. Andrew as an Apostle (or perhaps as the Apostle called by Christ to the College of the Twelve as its first member) was equal in his rank to St. Peter. Secondly, it seemed obvious that the saint's rank was shared by the church in which his mortal remains were kept.

Adalbert was buried in the Virgin Mary shrine in Gniezno and so the saint's metropolitan dignity, earned during his mission and confirmed by his martyrdom, was shared by the church and by the city.

We should look at this issue from a different angle as well. The example of Benevento discussed in Chapter 1 teaches us that the presence of St. Bartholomew's body in the local cathedral was one of the reasons why the diocese was elevated to the rank of archdiocese. The pope's explanation suggests that this was a cult-motivated necessity. He argued that thanks to its new rank the cathedral would prompt the faithful to pray particularly ardently. The idea was that the presence of such great relics required just as great veneration.

---

354   See Chapter 1, point 2.

355   We cannot rule out that other considerations were at play, when Gaudentius was chosen. According to Jan Tyszkiewicz, the choice of this particular individual was a political demonstration hostile to the Přemyslids—Jan Tyszkiewicz and Grażyna Jurkowlaniec, *Zjazd gnieźnieński w 1000 roku. Utworzenie Kościoła i zapowiedź Królestwa Polskiego*, Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Sejmowe, 2000, 27.

356   *Agnelli qui et Andreas Liber pontificalis Ecclesiae Ravennatis,* MGH Scriptores rerum Langobardicarum et Italicarum, 329. See Picard, *Le Souvenir des évêques*, 698–699; also Dvornik, *The Idea of Apostolicity*, 151–152.

Every medieval church had relics, because otherwise its altar could not be consecrated. Usually, these were very small fragments. In some higher-ranked churches, such as in cathedrals (though by no means in all of them), there were tombs holding some substantial parts of the mortal remains of a martyr or confessor, rarely whole bodies. This does not mean, of course, that the presence of these bodies must have been in each case an important argument in favour of transforming a cathedral into an archcathedral, and a bishopric into an archbishopric. The situation in Benevento was unique, because the local church was the resting place of the body of not just any saint but of an Apostle. This was a very rare occurrence in Europe. As I have tried to demonstrate, Otto III wanted to make Adalbert an apostle. It could well be argued that a cathedral in which the mortal remains of such a great saint were buried deserved to be elevated to the rank of archcathedral.

In point 3 of the present chapter I have pointed out that an early medieval ruler who personally carried the mortal remains of a saint would offer him precious gifts. They may have been precious reliquaries, altars or other liturgical objects, or "human" and institutional gifts. For instance, Charles the Bald gave Cornelius a golden altar and, at the same time, decided to double the number of canons at Compiègne in order for the holy pope to be properly venerated.[357] We are thus justified in hypothesizing that the Archbishopric of Gniezno was regarded as a gift for St. Adalbert. We know that the martyr received a magnificent altar from the emperor in Gniezno, an altar with a large antependium made of pure gold. The founding of an archbishopric would be another gift on the emperor's part—and a more magnificent gift at that.

As we can see, the Polish province was very closely connected to the Bishop of Prague, with the connection stemming from a variety of factors. Therefore, there are reasons for us to risk making the following claim: the title *Archiepiscopus sancti Adalberti* expressed a conviction of the people taking the relevant decisions in Rome that the Archbishopric of Gniezno was established thanks to St. Adalbert's merits and was established to allow for greater veneration of the martyr. This was an idea expressed, it would seem, by the author of the *Hildesheim Annals*, when he wrote that Otto III had made Gaudentius archbishop primarily because of his love for his venerable martyred brother and because he wanted to honour him even more.[358]

The facts presented here undoubtedly contained authentic motives guiding Otto III and Sylvester II as they were founding the Polish church province.

---

357   *S. Cornelii Compendiensis Translationes*, verse 14, 238.

358   *Annales Hildeshemenses*, 28.

These facts may have also been used in the controversy sparked by Gniezno's elevation.

6   Bolesław Chrobry as an Imperial Associate

I have written earlier (point 3 of the present chapter) that in 1000 in Gniezno Bolesław Chrobry was promoted to the rank of imperial associate and that this rank was defined by Otto III in religious terms: Poland's ruler was to help the emperor with his apostolic duties.[359] Time has come to specify what tasks and what powers were associated with the office in question. Let me once again return to the relevant fragment from Gallus's *Chronicle* in order to show the context in which it appears:

> Et tanta sunt illa die dileccionne couniti [sc. Otto et Bolezlauus], quod imperator eum fratrem et cooperatorem imperii constituit, et populi Romani amicum et socium appellavit. Insuper etiam in ecclesiasticis honoribus quicquid ad imperium pertinebat in regno Polonorum, vel in aliis superatis ab eo vel superandis regionibus barbarorum, sue suorumque successorum potestati concessit, cuius paccionis decretum papa Siluester sancte Romane ecclesie privilegio confirmavit.[360]

In the first sentence the author talks about Bolesław being entrusted with the office, in the second—about specific powers being granted to the Polish prince. That the two facts are presented next to one another and in this particular order shows that there is a cause-and-effect link between them. When making Bolesław an imperial associate, Otto III also made sure that the prince would have at his disposal relevant legal instruments.

---

359   Bolesław Chrobry's monarchy as a missionary state was described by Aleksander Gieysztor, "Sanctus et gloriosissimus martyr Christi Adalbertus: un Etat et une Eglise missionaires aux alentours de l'an Mille", in *La conversione al christianesimo nell'Europa nell'alto medioevo* Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo 14 (Spoleto: Presso la Sede del Centro, 1967), 611–647.

360   Gall, lib. I, cap. 6, 19–20 ("And in such love were they united that day that the emperor declared him his brother and partner in the Empire, and called him a friend and ally of the Roman people. And what is more, he granted him and his successors authority over whatever ecclesiastical honors belonged to the empire in any part of the kingdom of Poland or other territories he had conquered or might conquer among the barbarians, and a decree about this arrangement was confirmed by Pope Sylvester in a privilege of the holy Church of Rome"—*Gesta principum Polonorum*, 37–39).

These were prerogatives concerning the Polish Church, which hitherto had been the preserve of the Empire.[361] The term *honores* is ambiguous. It must have comprised various rights, both liturgical (for example, *laudes regiae*) and those relating to administration and jurisdiction. It would be hard to imagine that the right to exercise episcopal investiture was not among them. What is somewhat surprising, however, is the information that the granting of these powers was authorized by the Holy See. In this context Gallus Anonymus mentions the privilege issued by Pope Sylvester.

Thus, Bolesław Chrobry must have received special prerogatives from Otto III.[362] They must have gone far beyond the right of investiture itself, because this right did not come from the Holy See. At that time every monarch had a formally recognized influence on the choice of the holders of episcopal sees. Someone might say, however, that the appointment of bishops was within the powers of kings and Poland's ruler was not a king. This means that the situation that had arisen was against commonly accepted customs and that is why it required the pope's sanction. We have to agree with one premise of this argument: no one has been able to prove so far that a royal coronation took place in Gniezno in 1000. Too many arguments speak against this. On the other hand, we have to reject the other premise, because it is untrue. Although within the Empire the right of episcopal investiture was indeed exercised exclusively by kings around 1000, in some areas of France, for instance, the decisive say in filling vacant sees rested with princes or even counts.[363]

---

361   Gerard Labuda comments on this fragment of Gallus's chronicle in the following manner: the legal move was not about ceding imperial prerogatives to Bolesław Chrobry, but about recognizing the he had the same rights with regard to the Polish Church as were usually accorded to a king ("Zakres uprawnień władczych nad Kościołem polskim nadanych przez cesarza Ottona III księciu Bolesławowi Chrobremu w Gnieźnie w roku 1000," *Roczniki Historyczne* 64 (1998): 7–12). This interpretation is hardly acceptable; see polemical remarks by Dariusz Sikorski, "Jakie uprawnienia mieli cesarze do władania polskim Kościołem przed rokiem 1000? Na marginesie pewnej koncepcji Gerarda Labudy," *Czasopismo Prawno-Historyczne* 54 (2002), no. 1: 429–442.

362   Here I draw on an idea mooted by Maleczyński, "W sprawie zjazdu gnieźnieńskiego," 521–522, 534–535.

363   Auguste Dumas carries out a concise analysis of the issue, giving instructive examples in Amman and Dumas, *L'Eglise au pouvoir des laïques*, 191–21; see also Guy Devailly, "Les Grandes familles et l'épiscopat dans l'Ouest de la France et les pays de la Loire," *Cahiers de Civilisation Médiévale* 27 (1984): 49–55; for more on the social and cultural context of the phenomena in question, see Jacques Boussard, "Les Evêques en Neustrie avant la Réforme Grégorienne (950–1050 environ)," *Journal des Savants* (1970): 161–196.

The details in each situation may have differed depending on the geographical zone. In the Mediterranean region bishops were chosen following an election, but for example, the Count of Barcelona first had to give his consent for it to take place and he also had to agree to the choice of the candidate made by the people of the diocese.[364] On the other hand, the Count of Barcelona did not perform the investiture *per baculum*. This custom was completely unknown in the Mediterranean part of the Kingdom of France. Another ruler who interfered in the election of bishops was the Prince of Aquitaine, and his decision was final.[365] Thanks to Ademar of Chabannes we know that William V the Great granted investiture to the elect by handing him the crosier.[366] The Duke of Normandy, in turn, filled vacant sees simply by appointment. He did so not only after 1066, when he became King of England, but also before that date.[367]

Thietmar thought it normal that only kings appointed bishops and was outraged to note that in some countries this was the preserve of princes or even counts.[368] However, he represented the point of view of a man living in a country in which in those days the right to fill episcopal sees was in the king's hands only. The chronicler derived his prerogatives in this respect from anointment and coronation, because thanks to these acts a monarch became similar to Christ.[369] Yet there were powerful rulers in Europe at the time—for example in Scandinavia—who had the title of *rex*, but who were not crowned and anointed. Nevertheless, they freely filled vacant ecclesiastical offices, even the highest ones. The papacy did not question their powers in this respect. Nor was it outraged by investiture performed by princes and counts in France

---

364 Elisabeth Magnou-Nortier, *La Société laïque et l'Eglise dans la province ecclésiastique de Narbonne (zone cispyrénéenne) de la fin du VIIIᵉ à la fin du XIᵉ siècle*, Publication de l'Université de Toulouse-Le Mirail, série A 20 (Toulouse: Association des publications de l'Université de Toulouse-Le Mirail, 1974), 335–338, 342–343.

365 Treffort, "Le Comte de Poitiers," 431–435.

366 *Ademari Cabannensis Chronicon*, lib. III, cap. 57, 178.

367 Heinrich Böhmer, *Kirche und Staat in England und der Normandie im 11. und 12. Jahrhundert* (Leipzig: Dieterich'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, Theodor Weicher, 1899), 31.

368 Thietmar, lib. I, cap. 26, 32–34.

369 Roman Michałowski, "Podstawy religijne monarchii we wczesnym średniowieczu zachodnioeuropejskim. Próba typologii," *Kwartalnik Historyczny* 105 (1998), no. 4: 26–31, especially 29; Ludger Körntgen, *Königsherrschaft und Gottesgnade. Zu Kontext und Funktion sakraler Vorstellungen in Historiographie und Bildzeugnissen der ottonisch-frühsaliscen Zeit*, Orbis mediaevalis. Vorstellungswelten des Mittelalters 2 (Berlin: Oldenbourg Akademieverlag, 2001), 122–125.

and Spain. Some of them, including William V of Aquitaine,[370] were sincerely pious, often went on *ad limina apostolorum* pilgrimages and were welcomed with open arms by the vicar of Peter. No one raised the issue of investiture. No one complained, either, to the King of France, Henry I, when he ceded his authority over the Bishopric of Le Mans to the Count of Anjou, Geoffrey the Martel.[371]

It is difficult to believe that Sylvester II would issue a bull for Bolesław Chrobry concerning mainly the question of investiture. Indeed, there is no known papal document from the 10th century and the first half of the 11th century, granting or confirming a ruler's right to appoint bishops.[372] This was not necessary, because the principle aroused no doubts.

On the other hand, sometimes—or at least once—the Holy See issued a privilege granting a secular monarch specific prerogatives in church matters. But these went far beyond the issue of investiture. I mean here John XII's bull erecting the Archbishopric of Magdeburg (JL 3690). Under the document, the pope granted Otto I and his successors the right to divide tithes and other

---

370   Treffort, "Le Comte de Poitiers," passim.

371   Alfons Becker, *Studien zum Investiturproblem in Frankreich. Papsttum, Königtum und Episkopat im Zeitalter der gregorianischen Kirchenreform* (Saarbrücken: Westesy Verlag, 1955), 22.

372   There is an interesting bull by John X, issued in 921, in which the pope reprimands Herman I, Archbishop of Cologne, for the fact that, prompted by his fear of Giselbert, he consecrated Hilduin Bishop of Liège, although this was against Charles the Simple's will. Yet— he says—the old principle still applies: only a king who exercises his power by the will of heaven has the right to grant bishoprics (*Papsturkunden*, vol. 1, no. 48, 80–82; see also the pope's letter to Charles the Simple, no. 49, 82–83). However, this source cannot be interpreted as saying that only a king and not a lower-level ruler had the right of investiture. Although Giselbert tried to become Duke of Lorraine, he was not a ruler formally recognized, at least not by Charles the Simple. Thus, the problem was not that the rank of this ruler was too low, but that he was not a rightful ruler in the first place. We also need to bear in mind that John X wrote his bull at a time when "principalities" (*principautés*) were only beginning to emerge. So it was not yet clear what royal prerogatives—if any—could be taken over by lower-rank rulers. A different opinion is expressed by Labuda, *Studia*, vol. 2, 513. For more on the conflict over the incumbency of the Liège see, see Harald Zimmermann, "Der Streit um das Lütticher Bistum vom Jahre 920/921," *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung* 65 (1957): 15–52, an analysis of the bull in question on pp. 45–52; the relations between Charles the Simple and Giselbert, Eduard Hlawitschka, *Lotharingien und das Reich an dr Schwelle der deutschen Geschichte*, Schriften der MGH 21 (Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1968), 202–205. For a general overview of the situation see Sikorski, "Jakie uprawnienia mieli cesarze," 431–435.

duties among dioceses as they deemed appropriate,[373] as well as the right to establish new bishoprics among the Slavs as soon as they were converted to the Christian faith.[374] In the 10th century it was impossible to found a diocese without the consent of the Holy See or, at least, it was not regarded as appropriate; the division of tithes, too, was not up to the ruler, which is why a special privilege had to be issued. However, the pope did not raise the issue of investiture with regard to bishops who were to occupy the new sees, because it was clear to everybody that it was the prerogative of the king.

Otto III was well aware of the special rights of German rulers and took advantage of them at least on one occasion, doing this ostentatiously. In a document dated 6 December 995, he set new borders—considerably changing the old ones—of the Bishopric of Meissen. Henceforth the diocese was to encompass left-bank Silesia as well as eastern Bohemia including Libice. There were also corrections to the border with the Archbishopric of Magdeburg, to the disadvantage of the latter. The monarch allowed the Bishop of Meissen to collect tithes from all these territories. Names and titles are followed by the following sentence: "Notum sit omnibus in Christo fidelibus scilicet presentibus et futuris, quomodo nos pro remedio animarum dilecti avi nostri simul et patris nostri nec non pro nostrae animę remedio more antiquorum imperatorum et regum nostra regali potestate Misnensi episcopatui terminum posuimus nominando fines et determinationes locorum sicut infra tenetur".[375] The matter is clear:

---

373 *Papsturkunden*, vol. 1, no. 154, 283.

374 "Cum vero omnipotens Deus per pretaxatum servum suum, invictissimum inperatorem, suumque filium regem successoresque eorum vicinam Sclavorum gentem ad cultum Christianę fidei perduxerit, per eosdem in convenientibus locis secundum oportunitatem episcopatus constitui […] volumus […]"—ibid., 284 ("For since indeed omnipotent God has—through the agency of the first of his servants, the unvanquished emperor, and his son, the king, and their successors—led the neighbouring people of the Slavs to the cultivation of the Christian faith, we wish to have bishoprics established by them [the emperor, his son, and his successors] in appropriate places as opportunity provides").

375 DO III, no. 186 ("Let it be known to all the faithful in Christ, both at present and in the future, how we have set boundaries of the bishopric of Meissen, for the salvation of the souls of our beloved ancestors and also of our father, and equally for the salvation of our own soul. We have done this in the manner of the ancient emperors and kings by our royal power, naming the boundaries and extents of the places, as is recorded below"). Quoted after: *Codex diplomaticus nec non epistolaris Silesiae*, vol. 1, ed. Karol Maleczyński (Wrocław: Wrocławskie Towarzystwo Miłośników Historii, 1956), no. 3, 10. The authenticity of this document—beyond any doubt in my opinion—has been the subject of some discussions; see Helmut Beumann and Walter Schlesinger, "Urkundenstudien zur deutschen Ostpolitik unter Otto III," 1st ed. 1955, in W. Schlesinger, *Mitteldeutsche Beiträge zur deutschen Verfassungsgeschichte des Mittelalters* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht,

the power to set the borders of dioceses has long been granted to monarchs and Otto III is only exercising it. Thus, if we ask whether the German ruler claimed some rights to regulate church affairs in Poland, then the document under consideration provides an answer in the affirmative.[376] The question of the extent to which these claims were justified is of secondary importance.[377]

In the bull, Otto I's extraordinary prerogatives were linked to a missionary campaign: by converting the pagans in the territories won over to Christianity, the monarch would be able to create a diocesan organization. According to Gallus's text, the *ecclesiastici honores* granted to Bolesław referred both to lands that had already been Christianized as well as to those that were to be Christianized in the future.[378] We can guess that the imperial powers

<hr />

1961, 306–332, and in the supplement to the 2nd ed. 479–483; Gerard Labuda, "Studia dyplomatyczne i geograficzno-historyczne z dziejów Słowiańszczyzny Zachodniej," in idem, *Fragmenty dziejów Słowiańszczyzny Zachodniej*, vol. 1 (Poznań: Wydawnictwo Poznańskie, 1960), 133–148; Karol Maleczyński, "Die Politik Otto III. gegenüber Polen und Böhmen im Lichte der Meissener Bistumsurkunden vom Jahre 995," *Lětopis— Jahresschrift des Instituts für Sorbische Volksforschung*, Reihe B—Geschichte. 10/2, 1963: 162–203, especially 166–191. All more recent editors consider the diploma to be original, see e.g. K. Maleczyński in *Codex diplomaticus*, 9–10; *Schlesisches Urkundenbuch*, vol. 1, ed. Heinrich Appelt (Vienna, Cologne and Graz: Böhlau, 1971), no. 3, 3–4. Recently, a thesis has been put forward that although the document was drafted by the royal chancellery, it was not authenticated by the attachment of a seal (Theo Kölzer and Thomas Ludwig, "Das Diplom Ottos III. für Meissen," in *Europas Mitte um 1000*, vol. 2, 764–766). In other words, in the end Otto III decided not to grant such great privileges to Meissen. Some have even suggested that the Bishop of Meissen may have wanted to inveigle the monarch into granting him the privilege mentioned in the document and that he submitted a ready-made draft to the chancellery. This is hard to believe. If the royal scribe made a fair copy with such an extraordinary content, he must have consulted his superiors. In addition, it is doubtful whether the extraordinary preamble was by the document's addressee.

376   It is worth noting a hypothesis by Andrzej Pleszczyński, according to whom the issuing of the document in question was a demonstration against Bolesław Chrobry ("Początek rządów Bolesława Chrobrego," in *Viae historicae*, 226).

377   See Sikorski, "Jakie uprawnienia mieli cesarze," 436–442.

378   When it comes to the value of this fragment by Gallus as a source, some doubts have been expressed by Fried, *Otto III. und Bolesław Chrobry*, footnote 71 on147 and 180. He argues that the term *ecclesiastici honores* is a nearly literal echo of much later discussions concerning the regalia, especially the 1111 agreement between Paschal II and Henry V. In such a situation the information given by the chronicler should be interpreted with utmost caution, because we do not know the exact wording of the relevant fragment of *Liber de passione*. The author cites his own article: "Der Regalienbegriff im 11. und 12. Jahrhundert," *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters* 29 (1973): 450–528. There is no doubt that Gallus not only quoted *Liber de passione*, but also summarized and paraphrased it.

transferred to Bolesław included the right to found bishoprics. German rulers received this right in 962 from John XII, and now Otto III was granting it to the Polish prince—probably not everywhere, but only in the territories that were to be Christianized by Bolesław. We need to be aware of the fact that the founding bull for Magdeburg did not specify the eastern frontier of the emperor's activity. It just made a general mention of the Slavs, so his prerogatives covered the entire geographical zone. This is how the matter was understood by Otto III, as he generously granted a large part of Silesia and Libice to Meissen.

By emphasizing the religious tasks and powers of Bolesław Chrobry as an imperial associate, I do not suggest that they were limited only to the ecclesiastical sphere. This certainly was not the case. In that period the ruler's secular and religious duties were inextricably linked, even when the latter were stressed particularly strongly. In the last year of his reign Otto III bore the title of servant of the apostles, which does not mean that he was interested only in church matters. This must also have been the case with Bolesław Chrobry. Thus, the *cooperator Imperii* may have had other obligations to the Empire, including e.g. military duties, not necessarily in Sclavinia.[379]

We know very little about the religious tasks which Otto III and Poland's ruler were to have carried out together. Yet our imagination cannot fail to be captivated by an enterprise that was at least to some extent a joint one, that is, the mission entrusted to the disciples of St. Romuald.

The *Life of Five Brethren* tells us that the emperor decided to establish a monastery-hermitage and sought to attract some monks for this enterprise. The task of the monastery was to be the evangelization of the pagans.[380] Peter Damian, in turn, informs us that the emperor was acting at the request of Bolesław Chrobry.[381] Writing from the perspective of forty years and not knowing personally any of the participants in the events, the author may not have realized on whose initiative the monastery was founded. One thing is certain, however: this must have been a joint enterprise, if Otto III decided to have the

---

When summarizing and paraphrasing it, he used his own conceptual apparatus, which did not necessarily reflect the intention of the source. However, in my argument a key role is played by the information about Sylvester II's bull. It would be hard to imagine that the chronicler made this information up. It must have been mentioned in *Liber de passione*. In any case, the chronicler may have had the bull in question in front of him.

379 See Tadeusz Wasilewski, "Zjazd Gnieźnieński w roku 1000 i jego znaczenie polityczne i kościelne," in *Osadnictwo i architektura ziem polskich*, 30.

380 See Chapter III, point 4.

381 *Vita b. Romualdi*, cap. 28, 61.

monks in Poland and since an abbey was indeed erected there, enjoying the favour—and we know that for sure—of Bolesław Chrobry.[382]

Historians have noted that the monastery—known to have been entrusted with an evangelizing mission—was founded near the western frontier of Poland. It is easy to conclude from this that its target group was the Polabian Slavs.[383] This can be a surprising conclusion, for we have to take into account the fact that these Slavs lived in areas which—at least theoretically—belonged to the Dioceses of Brandenburg and Havelberg, and, consequently, to the Magdeburg province. In view of the above, the situation can or even has to be interpreted as follows: Bolesław Chrobry was of the opinion that as an imperial associate he had the right and the duty to Christianize Polabia. As he was the head of the Polish Church, with which he carried out this task, the Metropolitan See of Magdeburg was to be replaced in the region by the Archbishopric of Gniezno.

The view according to which the powers granted to Bolesław in 1000 included Polabia in their territorial scope has been known for some time.[384] To substantiate it, scholars like to cite the events of the interregnum following

---

382   For information about this monastery, see Gerard Labuda, "Szkice historyczne jede-
         nastego wieku. I. Najstarsze klasztory w Polsce," in *Z badań nad dziejami klasztorów w
         Polsce*, Archaeologia Historica Polona 2 (Toruń Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Mikołaja
         Kopernika, 1995, 7–73; Andrzej Pleszczyński, "Bolesław Chrobry konfratrem eremitów
         św. Romualda w Międzyrzeczu," *Kwartalnik Historyczny* 103 (1996) no. 1: 3–22; Stanisław
         Trawkowski, "Die Eremiten in Polen am Anfang des 11. Jahrhunderts," in *Svatý Vojtěch,
         Čechové a Europa*, ed. Dušan Třeštík and Josef Žemlička (Prague: Naklad Lidové Noviny,
         1997), 167–179; Teresa Dunin-Wąsowicz, "Najstarsi polscy święci: Izaak, Mateusz i Krystyn,"
         in *Kościół, kultura, społeczeństwo. Studia z dziejów średniowiecza i czasów nowożytnych*, ed.
         S. Bylina [et al.] (Warsaw: Semper, 2000), 35–47 (with new, interesting arguments indicat-
         ing Międzyrzecz as the location of the hermitage, 42–44). The history of the hermitage in
         question is discussed in an interesting manner—against the background of the earliest
         history of Polish monasticism—by: Aleksander Gieysztor, "Pierwsi benedyktyni w Polsce
         piastowskiej," in *Benedyktyni tynieccy w średniowieczu. Materiały z sesji naukowej Wawel-
         Tyniec, 13–15 października 1994*, ed. Klementyna Żurowska (Kraków: Tyniec, 1995), 9–21;
         Marek Derwich, "Studia nad początkami monastycyzmu na ziemiach polskich. Pierwsze
         opactwa i ich funkcje," *Kwartalnik Historyczny* 107 (2000), no. 2: 77–105.

383   Cywiński, "Druga metropolia Bolesława Chrobrego," 9 and passim.

384   Piotr Bogdanowicz, "Co można wydedukować z kroniki Thietmara? Ważny fragment
         z dziejów Bolesława Chrobrego," *Nasza Przeszłość* 10 (1959): 71–111; Jerzy Strzelczyk is
         inclined to accept the views of this author, Strzelczyk, *Otton III*, 137; Kazimierz Myśliński
         thinks in a similar vein, "Sprawa ziem połabskich w rozmowach Ottona III i Bolesława
         Chrobrego w Gnieźnie w r. 1000," *Studia Historica Slavo-Germanica* 22 (1997 [published:
         1999]): 11–13 and passim.

Otto III's death. They refer to the amazing ease with which Bolesław came to power over the German territories situated at the Polish border. Saxon magnates may have considered the Polish ruler's move to be lawful. However, it is difficult to achieve full clarity in the matter, if only because Bolesław's successes may have resulted from completely different factors, such as alliances linking him to some circles of the Saxon aristocracy.[385]

For quite some time a question has been running through the literature on the subject as to whether the title of imperial associate was in some way associated with the notion of Slavdom (S*clavania, Sclavinia*). This notion is expressed by two well-known and widely commented miniatures from manuscripts made in German painting workshops around the year 1000.[386] Each of them depicts the emperor in majesty receiving tribute from four personifications of provinces. The personifications are individualized by means of inscriptions. One miniature refers to them as *Italia, Germania, Gallia* and *Sclavania*,[387] the other—as *Roma, Gallia, Germania* and *Sclavinia*.[388]

There is no doubt that Bolesław's state was part of "Sclavania". This is evidenced by, among others, the dating of the document issued by Otto III in Gniezno. We can read there that the city in question was in "Sclavania".[389] However, this does not have to mean that from the territorial point of view the term was synonymous with Bolesław's rule, at least within the borders within which it really existed.[390] Its meaning was certainly much broader. The powers of an imperial associate might have covered areas inhabited also by those Slavs who had hitherto not recognized the Polish ruler's authority.

This would be a hypothesis worthy of a more thorough analysis, especially given the fact that it is supported by the Polabian direction of Bolesław's mission. However, I would like to stress another aspect of the problem. If there

---

385   This is an interpretation suggested by Knut Görich, "Eine Wende im Osten? Heinrich II. und Boleslaw Chrobry", in *Otto III.—Heinrich II. eine Wende?*, ed. B. Schneidmüller and S. Weinfurter, Mittelalter Forschungen 1 (Sigmaringen: Thorbecke, 1997), 95–167.

386   See Zygmunt Wojciechowski, "Patrycjat Bolesława Chrobrego", 1st ed. 1949, in idem, *Studia historyczne* (Warsaw: Pax, 1955), 114–117.

387   Bamberg, Staatsbibliothek, Class, 79—Percy Ernst Schramm, *Die deutschen Kaiser und Könige in Bildern ihrer Zeit. 751–1190*, new edition by Florentine Mütherich et al. (Munich: Prestel Verlag, 1983), no. 109, 205.

388   München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 4453, fol. 23ᵛ–24ʳ Schramm, *Die deutschen Kaiser*, no. 110, 205).

389   DO III, no. 349, 779.

390   For more on the meaning of *Sclavinia* in the early medieval Latin vocabulary, see Dieter Wojtecki, "Slavica beim Annalisten von Quedlinburg," *Zeitschrift für Ostforschung* 30 (1981): 164–177.

was a link between the title of imperial associate and the representations of Slavdom in the miniatures—which is beyond any doubt—it consisted first of all in something else. The miniatures testify to the fact that the German court regarded the Slavs as a people that contributed to the creation of the Empire.[391] We could even speak of a kind of ideological breakthrough. Hitherto the Slavs had been regarded solely as an object of conquest and Christianization. The role which Bolesław Chrobry was to play in the Empire reflected this breakthrough.

Two questions arise. To what extent did Bolesław Chrobry identify himself with the function set for him in Gniezno and how did the German elite responded to this role?

An invaluable source of information about the matter can be found in Bruno of Querfurt's writings, especially in his letter to the German king Henry II, written in Poland in late 1008 or early 1009.[392] At that time Bruno was preparing for a missionary expedition to Prussia during which, as it would turn out, he was martyred.[393] It is difficult to say what he really expected from his letter. A perfunctory reading seems to leave us in no doubt: the message included an earnest appeal to the king to completely revise his foreign policy. The

---

391   Labuda, "Zjazd i synod gnieźnieński," 116–117.

392   The most detailed exegesis of the letter is provided by Hans-Dietrich Kahl, "Compellere intrare. Die Wendenpolitik Bruns von Querfurt im Lichte hochmittelalterlichen Missions- und Völkerrechts," 1st ed. 1955, in *Heidenmission und Kreuzzugsgedanke in der deutschen Ostpolitik des Mittelalters*, ed. Helmut Beumann, Wege der Forschung 7 (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1973), 177–274; see also Jadwiga Karwasińska, "Świadek czasów Chrobrego—Brunon z Kwerfurtu," in *Polska w świecie*, 91–105.

393   For information about Bruno of Querfurt's biography, especially the last years of his life, see first of all Heinrich Gisbert. Voigt, *Brun von Querfurt* (Stuttgart: J. F. Steinkopf, 1907). For more on Bruno's missionary expeditions, see Leon Koczy, "Misja Brunona wśród Suigiów," *Annales Missiologicae* 5 (1932/33): 82–98; idem, "Misje polskie w Prusach i na Pomorzu", *Annales Missiologicae* 6 (1934): 52–186; Walerian Meysztowicz, "Szkice o świętym Brunie-Bonifacym," *Sacrum Poloniae Millenium* 5 (1958): 445–501; Jan Tyszkiewicz, "Misja z Polski w stepach u Pieczyngów. Kościół i państwo w czasach Bolesława Chrobrego," *Rocznik Tatarów Polskich* 4 (1997): 45–58; idem, "Brunon z Querfurtu i jego misje," in *Z dziejów średniowiecznej Europy Środkowo-Wschodniej. Zbiór studiów*, ed. J. Tyszkiewicz, Fasciculi Historici Novi 2 (Warsaw: Wydawnictwo DiG, 1998), 35–48; idem, "Brunon z Querfurtu na Rusi," in *E scientia et amicitia. Studia poświęcone Profesorowi Edwardowi Potkowskiemu w sześćdziesięciopięciolecie urodzin i czterdziestolecie pracy naukowej* (Warsaw and Pułtusk: Wyższa Szkoła Humanistyczna, 1999), 219–227; idem, "Bruno of Querfurt and the resolutions of the Gniezno Convention," 189–208; for more on the bishop's stay in Ruthenia, see also Andrzej Poppe, "Wokół chrztu Rusi," in *Narodziny średniowiecznej Europy*, ed. Henryk Samsonowicz (Warsaw: Wiedza Powszechna, 1999), 226–230. For more on Bruno's spirituality, see Chapter III, point 4.

missionary bishop entreated the monarch to give up hostile actions against Bolesław Chrobry and to concentrate on spreading the Gospel among the pagans, and, first to all—to withdraw from a scandalous alliance with the pagan Lutici against Christian Poland. Instead, using Bolesław' power, the emperor should turn against the Lutici and force them to accept Christianity. However, could Bruno of Querfurt have expected that Henry II would completely change his policy under the influence of his entreaties? And could he have assumed that his severe criticism of the king's actions would make the ruler well-disposed to the arguments presented in the letter, especially given the fact that the criticism was accompanied by praises of other rulers reigning at the time: Vladimir the Great and Bolesław Chrobry, a mortal enemy of the German monarch?

This is highly unlikely. It is true that the author tried to tone down the meaning of the letter—unfavourable to the addressee—by resorting to well-thought-out rhetorical devices, such as *captatio benevolentiae*.[394] On the other hand, he must have realized that the entire art of writing would be useless and that the letter not only would not convince the king but would irritate him in the extreme.[395] Even without it Bruno of Querfurt was a suspicious figure in Henry's eyes and he was well aware of that.[396] The bishop was probably inspired by another idea. He wanted to present the motives of his actions not so much to persuade the monarch to accept his reasoning, but to give a testimony to the truth. As he was embarking on a mission in the footsteps of St. Adalbert, Bruno must have considered death. Perhaps, then, the letter to Henry II was meant by its author as a kind of spiritual testament. Therefore, we cannot interpret it the way we interpret diplomatic notes or statements by politicians. The arguments used by the bishop should be treated in all seriousness. They were means to justify the author's position, which is obvious, but at the same time they also reflected his deepest convictions.

The whole letter revolves around the *ad gentes* mission. Bruno writes about missions in which he took part in the past, which he is still heading and

---

394   See Kahl, "Compellere intrare," especially 177–189.

395   Meysztowicz claimed that by sending the letter, its author had undertaken to mediate between Bolesław and Henry II (*Szkice*, 481 and elsewhere). This is highly unlikely given the weight and tone of the accusations made in the letter. For instance, Bruno threatened his king with divine retribution (*Epistola Brunonis ad Henricum*, 102, v. 9). Jerzy Strzelczyk is right when he writes: "Would Bruno have been able to return to Germany after the publication of this letter—hard to say"—*Apostołowie Europy* (Warsaw: Instytut Wydawniczy Pax, 1997), 223.

396   *Epistola Brunonis ad Henricum*, 101, vv. 4–14.

which he is to undertake soon. Many years ago he subordinated all his life to this cause and still remains faithful to it. At the same time, he demands that Henry II regard the evangelization of pagan peoples as the main task of his reign. He urges him to try to earn the title of apostle and gives the example of two great emperors from the past as role models: Constantine and Charlemagne. The author uses bitter words: in these unhappy times kings are busy persecuting Christians and there are no rulers who would try to convert the pagans.[397]

This was a purely rhetorical expression, which was to deal a painful blow to Henry, as other fragments suggest that, in fact, even today there are princes who have contributed greatly to the preaching of the Gospel, princes whom Bruno knows and with whom he collaborates. When it comes to his missionary journeys, the author is usually very succinct, with one exception, however. This exception is his mission to the Pechenegs. We cannot help thinking that his detailed account in his case is to show, among others, the role played by Vladimir the Great.[398] In spite of doubts over whether an expedition to such a savage and cruel people had any chance of success, the monarch personally accompanied the bishop to the Rus' border and then agreed to the peace terms negotiated by Bruno. This was an important matter for the success of the mission, because the Pechenegs were ready to accept Christianity provided that the duke respected the peace. Vladimir went even further in his nobility: he gave them his son as a hostage.[399] In addition, he sent to the Pechenegs a bishop whom Bruno had earlier consecrated.

Here is a monarch who not only takes care of the missionary, but who also subordinates his policy to the requirements of evangelization. There is no doubt that the portrait of the ruler of Rus' presented in the letter was a mirror in which the German king was to look and feel ashamed.[400]

In his letter Bruno of Querfurt writes little about the role played by Bolesław Chrobry in his missionary work, probably because he did not want to irritate Henry too much. The bishop does note, however, that the Polish ruler prom-

---

397 Ibid., 104. Bruno uses here some of the thoughts, terms and expressions he used for the first time in 1004, when he wrote the original version of the *Life of St. Adalbert* (*Adalberti Vita II*, cap. 10, 8–10). It is worth noting that the work contains even stronger accusations by Bruno against the rulers of his time.

398 *Epistola Brunonis ad Henricum*, 98–100.

399 It is of no great importance that, when giving his son to the Pechenegs, Vladimir the Great may not have been guided by any noble motives but by political calculation. Even if this was the case, Bruno of Querfurt may not have realized it. See Tyszkiewicz, "Brunon z Querfurtu na Rusi," 227.

400 This is the view of H.-D. Kahl, "Compellere intrare," 181–182.

ised him help in his journey to Prussia. At the same time, he bemoans the fact that Bolesław will not be able to fulfil his promise because of the war declared on Poland by Henry II.[401] Thus, he once again takes the opportunity to criticize the German king's policy, which disregarded higher principles.

The author was fully aware of the fact that the success of any mission *ad gentes* depended to a large extent on the attitude of princes and kings. This did not mean that every evangelizing campaign was to be headed by a ruler or that such a campaign would always be tantamount to a religious war, which perforce would have to be headed by the monarch. The bishop called for such a war against the Lutici, but he did not suggest any military action against the Pechenegs. In this latter case he was grateful to Vladimir for letting him reach the people in question and allowing him to carry out his mission. After the first successes he expected from him further logistical and diplomatic support as well as an appropriate—but peaceful—foreign policy. In other words, Bruno provided for various tasks for rulers in the Christianization of the pagans;[402] in addition, he knew—and this view was even more obvious—that no mission *ad gentes* happened in a political vacuum. That is why the bishop sought so hard to establish a *modus vivendi* with the high and mighty of this world, which in turn complicated the relations with his own king, Henry II. This is where the analyzed letter had its roots.

Realizing the political determinants of missionary activity, the author does not question the importance of heavenly assistance for its success. On the contrary, he refers to it again and again. Again and again he mentions God and St. Peter in this context. It is thanks to them that he is able to fulfil his missionary duties, it is thanks to them that he escaped death from the hands of the pagans, it is thanks to them that the evangelization progresses and the Church takes root in new countries.[403] Bruno of Querfurt is convinced that the successes of his evangelizing work do not stem from his personal merits, but from support from the above. At some point he states that all Black Hungarians have accepted the Christian faith, but he immediately adds that all this is the work of God, St. Peter and the martyrs, especially those that died in recent times.

---

401   *Epistola Brunonis ad Henricum*, 103, vv. 16–19.

402   This is largely the topic of Kahl's analysis, "Compellere intrare"; for more on Bruno's missionary ideology, see also Michał Tomaszek, "Brunon z Kwerfurtu i Otton II: powstanie słowiańskie 983 roku jako grzech cesarza," *Kwartalnik Historyczny* 109 (2002), no. 4, 5–23.

403   *Epistola Brunonis ad Henricum*, 97, vv. 10–11; 98, vv. 10–11; 99, vv. 15–16; 100, vv. 5–6 and 16–17; 101, vv. 1 and 10–11; 103, v. 15; 106, vv. 10–11.

His, namely Bruno's, efforts were of minimal significance to the success of the mission.[404]

The belief in Divine intervention is combined in Bruno's case with his belief in the intercession of saints. I have already mentioned the importance of martyrs' intercession to the Christianization of peoples. The bishop attributes a special role to the Prince of the Apostles.[405] This is hardly surprising. The author of the letter is clearly convinced that St. Peter is a person who, together with God, established the Church in the Christianized countries, specifically, in the part of Europe in which the author himself is active.[406] This is why Bruno of Querfurt is convinced that he carries out the evangelization of the pagans on behalf of the saint in question.[407] This may also be the reason why he believes that the first of the Apostles is his lord (*senior*).[408] The bond between the Christianizer *par excellence*, that is the Prince of the Apostles, and Bruno the missionary became institutional. After all, the bishop went on a mission thanks to a licence obtained from the pope, the vicar of Peter, setting out on it with the pallium received from him,[409] the pallium, which was both a mark of spiritual dignity and a Petrine relic.[410] This is the context in which

---

404   Ibid., 100/101; see also 98, vv. 8–9. I have written earlier about this in point 3 of the present chapter.

405   The prominence of St. Peter in the letter was noted long time ago, see e.g. Heinrich Zeissberg, "Die öffentliche Meinung im 11. Jahrhundert über Deutschlands Politik gegen Polen," 1st edition 1868, in *Heidenmission und Kreuzzugsgedanke*, 11. See also Voigt, *Brun von Querfurt*, 169; Aleksander Gieysztor, "Saints d'implantation, saints de souche dans les pays évangélisés de l'Europe du Centre-Est", in *Hagiographie, cultures et sociétés*, 578. Some scholars were inclined to ascribe the importance Bruno attached to St. Peter in the evangelizing work to the rivalry between the Eastern and the Western Church in missionary territories; see Jean Leclercq, "Saint Romuald et le monachisme missionaire," *Revue bénédictine* 72 (1962): 321. This is a questionable interpretation, especially if we take into account the fact that there are no suggestions in this respect in Bruno's writings.

406   "Duo magna mala quam Deus et pugnans Petrus in rudi paganismo cępere, noua ęcclesia prope sentire debet" (*Epistola Brunonis ad Henricum*, 103, vv. 15–16)—"The new church, which God and Peter, fighting, had planted in wild pagan territory, ought to suffer two great evils."

407   "[…] episcopus sum, qui de sancto Petro euangelium Christi gentibus porto" (*Epistola Brunonis ad Henricum*, 98, verses 11–12)—"I am a bishop, I carry the gospel of Christ, from Saint Peter, to the [heathen] peoples."

408   Ibid., 97, v. 10.

409   Thietmar, lib. VI, cap. 94, 386.

410   For information about Bruno of Querfurt's missionary licence, see Anzelm Weiss, "Pozwolenie na głoszenie Ewangelii (Licentia apostolica ad missionem) w czasach św. Wojciecha," *Universitas Gedanensis* 9 (1997), nos. 1–2 (16–17): 61–71.

we should interpret the responsory intoned by Bruno as he was entering the territory that belonged to the Pechenegs: "Petre, amas me, pasce oues meas".[411] These are words from the Gospel (John 21:15–17), in which Christ entrusts human souls to the first of the Apostles. As he entered the land of the people to whom he was to preach the Gospel, the missionary bishop was aware of the fact that he was fulfilling the duties entrusted by the Lord to St. Peter and this is why in his prayer he referred to the event mentioned above and well-known from the New Testament.[412] In addition, it is worth noting that in the following verse of John's Gospel Christ foretells Peter's martyrdom as the crowning glory of this pastoral work. Perhaps then, in saying the verse quoted above, Bruno was also preparing himself spiritually for the fate he might suffer at the hands of the pagans.[413] When carrying out the mission of the Prince of the Apostles, he knew that it was to be completed by martyrdom.

As we know, Bruno wrote his letter in Poland. There is no doubt that he saw the country as a privileged place for a mission. Poland had a favourable geographical location, because it was surrounded by vast territories inhabited by pagan peoples. However, in Bruno's opinion, other factors played an important role as well.

First, we should mention the person of the ruler. In the letter Bruno writes emphatically about his passionate love for Bolesław Chrobry. In this context he uses terms with serious legal-political connotations, terms like fidelity (*fidelitas*) and friendship (*amicitia*). This impresses the reader all the more, because the words were addressed to a man who considered the Polish prince to be his mortal enemy. If we take into account the huge importance in the author's life of the imperative to evangelize the pagans, we will come to the conclusion that this love must have been based, at least partly, on shared views in this weighty matter. Indeed, the author clearly states that Bolesław has promised him help in his missionary expedition to Prussia.

We will be justified in assuming that Bolesław was involved in Bruno of Querfurt's other ventures as well. We know that over the few years separating the episcopal consecration of the Saxon missionary and his death, he carried out some extremely intense evangelizing work among the pagans.

---

411   *Epistola Brunonis ad Henricum.*, 99, v. 8.

412   Meysztowicz (*Szkice*, 490) assumes that Bruno of Querfurt sang this particular responsory, because this was the Feast of the Chair of St. Peter (strictly speaking the feast was two days earlier). Perhaps this was indeed the case. That the author quoted these words in the letter may have stemmed, however, from the fact that he wanted to underline on whose behalf and under whose patronage he worked as a missionary.

413   See Poppe, "Wokół chrztu Rusi," 230.

He Christianized the Hungarians, the Pechenegs, the Swedes as well as an unknown tribe living on the border of Prussia and Rus', where he received his palm of martyrdom. We also know that at that time he came to Poland as well—and more than once, it would seem. The chronology of the last period of the saint's life is unclear, because in the letter he talks about the events in his life in a complicated and disorderly manner. When it comes to the role of Bolesław Chrobry in these ventures, he is silent, except for one case indicated above. However, there is no doubt that he undertook the Swedish mission when he was in Poland and was using the support of the Piast court.[414] It would be hard for us to imagine a different scenario, if we take into account the fact that the then King of Sweden, Olaf Skötkonung, was Bolesław Chrobry's nephew and that Olaf's mother was probably visiting her brother at the time, expelled by her second husband, Sweyn Forkbeard. The Swedish court must have been very friendly to the missionaries, if the monarch himself was baptized.

There is some indirect evidence to suggest that Bolesław may have also contributed to the Pecheneg expedition. Bruno writes extensively about Vladimir's attitude to the expedition, but he does not say from which country and with whose support the mission arrived in Rus'. Apart from Poland, that country theoretically may have been Hungary, where the bishop had stayed previously, taking part in its Christianization. Significantly, however, the author of the letter does not mention King Stephen at all, despite the fact that he writes, albeit briefly, about the evangelization of the Black Hungarians. We can conclude, therefore, that the relations between Bruno and Stephen were not very good. In such circumstances it would be hard to image that the Pecheneg mission was supported by the Esztergom court. Yet it must have been supported some ruler. After all, it need provisions, protection, transport and, finally, diplomatic patronage of the Duke of Rus'.[415]

It is worth expanding the research and include in it the *Life of St. Adalbert* written by Bruno even before he came to Poland. The work does not mention the evangelizing work of the Saxon bishop, but it does mention Bolesław Chrobry's attitude to another missionary. The hagiographer states that the

---

414   Koczy, "Misja Brunona wśród Suigiów," passim; Gerard Labuda, *Fragmenty dziejów Słowiańszczyzny Zachodniej*, vol. 2 (Poznań: Wydawnictwo Poznańskie, 1964), 131–134; Władysław Duczko, "Real and Imaginary Contributions of Poland and Rus to the Conversion of Sweden", in *Early Christianity in Central and East Europe*, 130–132.

415   On the matter of Bolesław's contribution to Bruno's missionary ventures, see first of all works by Jan Tyszkiewicz mentioned earlier in this subchapter. Bolesław's involvement in these enterprises is very sceptically and probably unjustly viewed by Trawkowski, "Bolesław Chrobry i eremici," passim.

Polish ruler helped St. Adalbert in his work and effort, a helper appointed by God himself.[416] The nature of his work was missionary. At the moment to which these words refer, Adalbert did not know yet whether he would be able to convert the pagans or whether, against his will, he would have to return to the See of Prague. It was precisely at that time that Bolesław helped him, sending his emissaries to Bohemia. The emissaries returned with a negative reply: the people of the diocese did not want their bishop back. So the bishop was free to go.

Bolesław assisted Adalbert in his missionary work also later. As we know—a fact that Bruno emphasizes—he provided the missionary with resources enabling him to go to Prussia. In general, as the author says, he showed great love for Adalbert.[417]

In the second version of the *vita* compiled some years later in Poland, the author referred to Bolesław in the same sentence as the mother of servants of God.[418] Bruno was writing this already from his personal experience. As Adalbert before him, he, too—a missionary wanting to preach the Word of God with all his heart—was warmly received at the court in Gniezno. Yet being the mother of the servants of God means something more than just being friendly to priests and monks; this also means, perhaps above all, supporting them in tasks to which they are called. Bruno's task was the mission *ad gentes*; therefore, if he used such a warm expression, he must have clearly found help and understanding in Bolesław in everything that concerned the evangelization of the pagans.[419] This was the same Bolesław whom he calls elsewhere *princeps christianissimus*.[420]

I have just mentioned that, according to the hagiographer, Bolesław was St. Adalbert's helper, which meant, first of all, that he helped him in his missionary work. The author goes a step further and says that Bolesław had this role entrusted to him by heaven. There is another fragment in Bruno's writings

---

416   "Ergo quem suo labori adiutorem Deus preparauit, ducem Polanorum Bolizlauum rerum dubius petit [i.e. St. Adalbert]" (*S. Adalberti Vita II*, cap. 23, 28)—"Therefore, in doubt about these matters, he [Saint Adalbert], sought out Bolesław, the Duke of the Poles, whom God had equipped to help him [Saint Adalbert] in his work."

417   Ibid., cap. 24, 29.

418   "Ergo quem suo labori adiutorem Deus preparauit, ducem Polonorum, Dei servorum matrem Boleslauum rerum dubius petit" (*Adalberti Vita II*, Redactio brevior, cap. 22, 60)—"Therefore, in doubt about these matters, he sought out Bolesław, the Duke of the Poles, mother of the servants of God, whom God had equipped to help Him in his work."

419   See Karwasińska, "Świadek czasów Chrobrego," 102; Trawkowski, "Bolesław Chrobry i eremici," 169.

420   *Adalberti Vita II*, Redactio brevior, cap. 25, 63.

which suggests a conviction that the Polish monarch was chosen by God, as it were. Let us return to the letter. When assessing the results of Henry II's war against Poland, Bruno writes as follows: "Certainly, man plans, God rules. Did the king [that is, Henry II] not enter with the pagans this land with all the might of the kingdom? What happened then? Did St. Peter, of whom he claims to be a tributary, and St. Adalbert not act as protectors? Had they not wanted to help, never would have the Five Brethren, who shed their blood and [instilling] the fear of God, perform numerous miracles, been laid to rest in his land".[421] The German ruler's defeat in 1005 is seen by Bruno as having been caused by the intervention of the saints. Worthy of note is the argument which is to persuade Henry that Poland was supported also by the Five Brethren. It refers to common medieval beliefs concerning the reasons why relics were kept in a particular location. In those days people widely believed that it was not up to man's will to determine where the venerable remains would be kept, but that it was determined by the saints to which the remains belonged.[422] The author finds another truth obvious as well. The assistance of martyrs and confessors is provided above all to the people and the country that possess their mortal remains. Thus, if the remains of the Five Polish Brethren are buried in Poland, it is because these saints, currently before God, want to protect Poland and its ruler.

At the same time Bruno was convinced—a view he expressed, as we know, in another part of the letter—that the merits of the martyrs who had given their lives in the "present" day, could make a mission successful. He meant here St. Adalbert and, in fact, the Polish Brethren. The context of his assertion suggests that the influence of their intercession was not limited to Poland; in this particular case it also covered Hungary. On the other hand, the presence of the venerable remains in the Piast state put Bolesław Chrobry in a privileged

---

421   "Certe homo cogitat, Deus ordinat. Nonne cum paganis et christianis hanc terram in uiribus regni rex intrauit? Quid tum? Sanctus Petrus cuius tributarium se asserit, et sanctus martyr Adalbertus, nonne protexerunt? Si adiuuare nollent, nunquam sancti qui sanguinem fuderunt, et sub diuino terrore multa miracula faciunt, quinque martyres occisi in terra sua requiescerent" (*Epistola Brunonis ad Henricum*, 103, vv. 2–6)—"Certainly, man thinks, and God disposes. For did not the king enter this land with full forces, both pagan and Christian? And what then? Did not Saint Pater, whose tributary he claimed to be, and Saint Adalbert the Martyr, protect him? If they did not want to help, the five blessed martyrs who shed their blood and under divine apprehension perform many miracles would never have rested, slaughtered, in their land."

422   Roman Michałowski, "Przyjaźń i dar w społeczeństwie karolińskim w świetle translacji relikwii," part I: "Studium źródłoznawcze," *Studia Źródłoznawcze* 28 (1983): 1–39; part II: "Analiza i interpretacja," ibid. 29 (1985): 9–65.

position in a way, because the power of saints was present at its most intense in the resting place of the mortal remains. Thus, if St. Adalbert[423] and the Five Martyrs wanted to be laid to rest in Poland, this may have been because its ruler was to play a missionary role by the will of heaven. This was the conclusion of Bruno's thought, although he did not present it explicitly.

Among the saints protecting Bolesław, Bruno listed St. Peter first, justifying this by the fact that the ruler was a tributary of the Prince of the Apostles. As we know, he referred here to a legal fact resulting from the donation described in a summary of the document known as *Dagome iudex*. Thus, Bolesław was formally linked to the saint, who was believed by the author of the letter to be the lord of missions, especially in Central and Eastern Europe. A question, therefore, arises: was it not the case that Bruno of Querfurt saw Poland's ruler as a man called to carry out the missionary work precisely because he was a tributary of the Prince of the Apostles? It is impossible to find an unequivocal answer to this question, but this is a possibility that should be taken into account.

The conclusions from the sources under consideration are as follows: Bruno was happy, because in Bolesław he had found a valuable protector and associate. He was able to formulate his opinion on the matter, when he observed the prince's involvement in missionary work. But at the same time he came to conclusions that went beyond the natural order. He was inclined to believe that God himself had entrusted Bolesław with the role of protector of the mission and the missionaries. The bishop was greatly impressed by the fact that the bodies of contemporary evangelizing martyrs were buried in Poland. All these facts and ideas made up an image of Poland as a country of great consequence with regard to the purposes which Bruno considered to be the most important.

We know very well that not all German Church dignitaries shared Bruno of Querfurt's views concerning Bolesław Chrobry and the role he played. Thietmar himself can be an example here. It is, however, significant that such voices were heard among the spiritual and political elites of the Empire. These were voices of people with a shared reverence for St. Adalbert and deep attachment to the *missio ad gentes* as the main religious imperative. Of course, we cannot say to what extent they were representative in Germany and, more

---

423   "Est in parte regni civitas magna Gnezne, ubi sacro corpori placuit quiescere, ubi mille miraculis fulget, et si corde ueniunt, recta petentibus salutes currunt" (*Adalberti Vita II*, cap. 24, 29–30)—("There is in that part of the kingdom a great city, Gniezno, where it is fitting for the sacred body to rest, where it shines in a thousand miracles, and if they come with [a good] heart, prosperity rushes to those seeking the right things.")

broadly, in the Empire. On the other hand, it is highly probable that Otto III thought like Bruno.

As Otto raised Bolesław Chrobry to the rank of imperial associate, he must have taken into account the political and military power of the Polish prince. This was a prerequisite; without it, Bolesław would not have been able to carry out the tasks set by the emperor, neither when it came to missions and Christianization, nor in strictly political and military matters. The emperor must have remembered that the Polish-German alliance, which resulted from a specific and stable geopolitical situation, had been going on for at least a dozen or so years and had proved useful for the German side more than once. But Otto III knew very well how great a support was provided by the Pole for St. Adalbert; he knew, too, that the martyr's body was buried in Poland's capital. He may have seen the hand of God in this—God himself designated Bolesław as an associate in the apostolic work. In this respect, we can rely only on conjectures. They are, however, within the bounds of probability.

7 German Archbishoprics in the Face of Otto III's Church Policy

I have noted earlier that the evangelization of the pagans was an important element of Otto I's ethos as an emperor and before that, as a king aspiring to the imperial crown. The same ethos influenced the thinking of the episcopate and of the clerics in archiepiscopal curias, or at least some of them. Both founding bulls and the records of the Ravenna synod stress that the task of the Magdeburg province is *missio ad gentes*. The same element can be found in two authentic 968 bulls by John XIII issued for Adalbert, the first Archbishop of Magdeburg,[424] and the idea is expressed even more strongly in Otto I's mandate for Saxon aristocrats from late 968.[425] It will not be an exaggeration

---

424 *Papsturkunden*, vol. 1, no. 190, 374–376 (JL 3728); no. 192, 378–379 (JL 3731).

425 "Igitur Magadaburgensi civitate, sicut omnium vestrorum novit caritas, archiepisco-palem sedem fieri desiderantes, oportunum etiam nunc temporis ad hoc peragendum tempus invenientes, consilio venerabilis archiepiscopi Hattonis et Hildeuuardi episcopi ceterorumque fidelium nostrorum virum venerabilem Adalbertum episcopum, Rugis olim prędicatorem destinatum et missum, archiepiscopum et metropolitanum totius ultra Albiam et Salam Sclauorum gentis modo ad deum conversę vel convertendę fieri decrevimus pariter et elegimus, quem et Romam pro pallio a domno papa suscipiendo direximus" (*Urkundenbuch des Erzstifts Magdeburg*, vol. 1, no. 67, 97)—"As the love of all of you knows, since we desire for the city of Magdeburg that it become an archepiscopal see, and since we believe that this is a suitable time to carry this out, we have selected the venerable man, bishop Adalbert, who had once been sent as preacher to the Russians,

to say that the church province in question was a missionary province *par excellence*.[426] Such were the goals set for the province at the beginning of its existence and the local clerics were aware of this for several generations.

Very involved in the *missio ad gentes* was also the Archbishopric of Hamburg.[427] Established, like the Archbishopric of Magdeburg, to Christianize the pagans, it was inspired by the traditions of its first bishop, St. Ansgar, a zealous missionary of Scandinavia. In the 10th century it had several archbishops, who were also missionaries, like Unni who personally converted the Danes. We know very little for certain about the earliest stages in the Christianization of Denmark, but there is no doubt that Unni's successor, Adaldag, must have been deeply involved in the creation of the local church organization, if the newly-established bishoprics in Schleswig, Ripen and Aarhus were incorporated into the Hamburg province. Adaldag was also active among the Obotrites and the bishopric founded there, too, became was part of the Hamburg church province. The activity of the metropolitan see in question went even further in the late 10th century. The Hamburg archbishops sent missions that reached Sweden and Norway.[428] Hamburg undertook evangelizing ventures in the 11th century as well. The problem was, however, that the Scandinavians, who aspired to ecclesiastical independence, preferred to bring their missionaries from elsewhere.

In the context of the present analysis, it is important to specify the role which the ideology in question served in Mainz. Let us begin with the following observation. The province was thought to have been founded by St. Boniface, commonly regarded as the Christianizer of Germania. The Mainz Church remembered this with gratitude. Moreover, in the 10th–11th century (and later), the Church used the martyr's merits in the evangelization of pagan peoples to strengthen its position in Germany. Citing Boniface's contribution

---

and decreed that he should become archbishop and metropolitan of all the people of the Slavs beyond the Elbe and the Saale who are now converted to God, or are still to be converted. This we have done with the advice of the venerable archbishop Hatto, bishop Hildeward, and our other followers, and we have sent Adalbert to Rome in order to receive the pallium from the lord pope."

426 By using the term "missionary province" here and elsewhere, I do not mean any special canonical status—after all, Magdeburg was an "ordinary" church province—but the fact that it was involved in the evangelization of the pagans and that this involvement was expected of it.

427 For information about the 10th century, see e.g. Büttner, "Die christliche Kirche ostwärts der Elbe," 148–152, 155–163; Angenendt, *Kaiserherrschaft und Königstaufe*, 276–283.

428 Ekkehard Eickhoff, *Kaiser Otto III. Die erste Jahrtausendwende und die Entfaltung Europas* (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1999), 140–141.

in this field, it sought to obtain papal vicariate, primacy and the right to crown German kings.[429]

It is not easy to determine the scale of Mainz's missionary involvement in the 10th century, but it was probably greater than it might first appear.[430] Let us start by noting that Archbishop Frederick (d. 954) was interested in the evangelization of the pagans, although we cannot say what concrete action he took in that respect.[431] In the late 10th century a Bishop Frederick was active in Iceland. He is known from sagas and was probably identical with an auxiliary bishop (*chorepiscopus*) of the Metropolitan of Mainz, Willigis.[432] What we know for certain is the fact a predecessor of the latter, Archbishop William, collaborated on Adalbert's journey to Kiev. In addition, we know that the Diocese of Halberstadt, bordering on Polabia, was part of the province, which also comprised bishoprics established in 948 in Slavic territories. It would be difficult to imagine in such a situation that the Mainz see was not involved in the evangelizing ventures among the pagans in Polabia. Even if we assume that this involvement did not go beyond a certain minimum, Mainz still had the right to be recognized as a missionary see, if only because its bishops were sent *ad gentes*.

When the two Bohemian bishoprics were established in the 970s, they were subordinated to Mainz. From the point of view of geography, this was a strange move. There was no territorial connection between the Přemyslid domain and the Mainz province, and Prague itself had previously been part of the Diocese of Regensburg and, thus, of the Salzburg province. It would have been obvious in such a situation for the Bohemian bishoprics to be incorporated into the Salzburg province. Some claim that the infringement of its rights was motivated by a desire to punish its archbishop for taking part in Henry the Quarrelsome's conspiracy. However, this interpretation does not explain the whole problem. In the north-east the Diocese of Prague bordered

---

429   Heinz Thomas, "Erzbischof Siegfried I von Mainz und die Tradition seiner Kirche. Ein Beitrag zur Wahl Rudolfs von Rheinsfelden," *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters* 26 (1970): 368–399, especially 385–388; Franz Staab, "Die Mainzer Kirche. Konzeption und Verwirklichung in der Bonifatius- und Theonesttradition," in *Die Salier und das Reich*, ed. S. Weinfurter, vol. 2: *Reichskirche in der Salierzeit* (Sigmaringen: Thorbecke, 1991), 31–77, especially 40–49.

430   Büttner, "Die christliche Kirche ostwärts der Elbe," 157, 163–164.

431   Friedrich Lotter, *Der Brief des Priesters Gerhard an den Erzbischof Friedrich von Mainz. Ein kanonistisches Gutachten aus frühottonischer Zeit*, Vorträge und Forschungen, Sonderband 17 (Sigmaringen: Thorbecke, 1975), 58.

432   Eickhoff, *Kaiser Otto III*, 147.

on the Diocese of Meissen, which was subordinated to Magdeburg. Thus, if Otto II did not want to consent to a Bavarian province, he should have agreed to a Saxon one. This did not happen, however. The only explanation that comes to mind is the following: this was about making up for the losses suffered by Mainz following the establishment of the Archbishopric of Magdeburg.[433] Yet we have to realize that the expansion of its jurisdiction to include the Bohemian dioceses was not only a form of territorial compensation; it also created new possibilities for evangelizing the pagans. Otto I's decision of 967–68 cut off Mainz from missionary countries and Otto II's decision re-established a connection with them. This was not only about the fact that Bohemia itself was not completely Christianized yet, but about the fact that it bordered on lands inhabited by semi-pagan or simply pagan peoples, such as the southern Polish tribes. Perhaps Archbishop William did not want to agree to the founding of the province on the Elbe also because he saw in it a risk that Mainz's role in the missionary work would be questioned.

Recent studies into the so-called *Foreign Annals*, provide us with data that allow us to say that the metropolitan see on the Rhine indeed try to take advantage of the new opportunity. The *Foreign Annals* is a quite commonly used term in modern Polish historiography describing a work which was written outside the Piast state and which became the basis for the *Old Annals* of the Cracow Chapter. Tomasz Jasiński has managed to lend credence to a hypothesis whereby in its original form the work in question saw the light of day in Mainz, thanks to Archbishop William. It expressed the Ottonian imperial ideology, as it was interpreted by that great prince of the Church. After his death it was supplemented by information concerning some Archbishops of Mainz and around 975 a copy of it found its way to Cracow. Continued and combined with Gniezno records, it gave rise to the *Old Annals* of the Cracow Chapter.[434]

---

433   Beumann, "Entschädigung von Halberstadt," 390.

434   The scholar expressed his view on the beginnings of Polish annal writing in a series of logically linked articles: Tomasz Jasiński, "Początki polskiej annalistyki," in *Nihil superflluum*, 129–146; idem, "Rocznik poznański. Ze studiów nad annalistyką polską i czeską," in *Aetas media—aetas moderna. Studia ofiarowane Profesorowi Henrykowi Samsonowiczowi w siedemdziesiąta rocznicę urodzin* (Warsaw: Instytut Historyczny Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, 2000), 664–672; idem, "Rocznik obcy w Roczniku kapituły krakowskiej," in *Scriptura custos memoriae. Prace historyczne*, ed. D. Zydorek, Publikacje Instytutu Historii UAM, 44 (Poznań: Instytut Historii Uniwersytetu Adama Mickiewicza, 2001), 217–224; idem, "Zagadnienie autorstwa Rocznika obcego. Przyczynek do historiografii niemieckiej X stulecia," *Roczniki Historyczne* 68 (2002): 7–25; idem, "Rola rocznika augijskiego w rozwoju annalistyki polskiej i niemieckiej", *Roczniki Historyczne* 69 (2003): 71–78.

I realize that this reconstruction is hypothetical. However, if it is correct—and much suggests that it is—then immediately after the Diocese of Prague was founded and incorporated into the Rhine province, a mission from Mainz must have reached Poland. If it brought with it the annals, which emphatically showed the greatness of the Mainz Church (there are, for example, several important entries concerning St. Boniface), this means that a missionary centre of great significance was being organized in Cracow.

Thus, rather unexpectedly, we find ourselves with evidence of Mainz's considerable interest in the Christianization of the remotest parts of its province.

It is worth referring once again to the 962 founding bull for Magdeburg. According to John XII's wish, all five German metropolitans (those of Mainz, Trier, Cologne, Salzburg and Hamburg) were to take under their care two local Churches that were being founded at the time: the Archbishopric of Magdeburg and the Bishopric of Merseburg. The pope also expected the church dignitaries in question to become involved in the further expansion of the Church organization in the Slavic territories. If the emperor wanted to establish a new diocese in the region and if the Metropolitan of Magdeburg intended to consecrate a bishop for it, they would have to ask these archbishops for their consent.[435] We may see in this clause an attempt to win over the highest ranked clerics in the German Church to such unpopular a cause as the founding of a new archbishopric. The Holy See proposed that they participate in the evangelization of the pagans. This is a measure of the weight attached by the Ottonian episcopate to the *ad gentes* mission.

In such circumstances the founding of the Archbishopric of Gniezno touched a very sensitive spot. We have no evidence to determine Mainz's reaction to the event and can only guess that Mainz was not pleased, having lost Cracow, which had figured somewhere in its plans.[436]

On the other hand, it is not difficult to say that Magdeburg's reaction was unequivocally negative. Highly instructive in this respect are two diplomatic sources: a forged document of John XIII (JL†3729–3730) for Archbishop

---

435 *Papsturkunden*, vol. 1, no. 154, 283–284. †

436 Cf. however remarks by Jerzy Strzelczyk, who is inclined to believe that Archbishop Willigis quite easily reconciled himself to the loss of his metropolitan authority over Cracow ("Willigis z Moguncji," in *Memoriae amici et magistri*, 55–65, also, the basic literature on the subject listed there). The Metropolitan of Mainz was realistic, so he reconciled himself to this, but the question is whether it was easy for him. Strzelczyk rightly points to the difficult situation in which Willigis found himself during Otto III's minority and the ruthlessness with which his position in the German Church was attacked by Otto III and successive popes: Gregory V and Sylvester II.

Adalbert (968–981)[437] and a draft of a papal document (of John XVIII?) for the Archbishopric of Magdeburg (JL†3823).[438]

The document allegedly of John XIII has survived in two versions: shorter, in the form of a letter, and longer, in the form of a privilege. Recently, scholars have come to believe that the shorter version was made earlier. This version will be the focus of my interest; the longer version is largely omitted from the present analysis.

The long discussion about John XIII's bull was resolved when it became possible to demonstrate beyond any doubt that the person dictating the document must have had before him Gregory V's bull for the palace chapel in Aachen, dated 8 February 997.[439] In a fragment concerning the establishment of the college of cardinals, the Magdeburg document contains a clause under which no one can celebrate mass at the altar of St. Maurice except for cardinal-priests, the abbot of St. John on the Mountain and bishops. Why "bishops" in the plural, if there was naturally one metropolitan at Magdeburg, and why does the author fail to mention the archbishop, if the metropolitan was an archbishop? In order to answer this question, it suffices to refer to a similar clause in the Aachen bull. There, in addition to cardinals, only two clerics could celebrate mass: the Archbishop of Cologne and Bishop of Liège. This is understandable, for Aachen was located in the Cologne province and the Liège diocese. Thoughtlessly, although the forger omitted the names referring to Cologne and Liège, instead of replacing them with the name of the Archbishop of Magdeburg, he used the term "bishops".[440]

There are other arguments, too, suggesting that John XIII's bull was fabricated. It has been pointed out that the number of cardinals to serve at the altar of St. Maurice is implausibly high, higher than it was customary for the Roman Church at the time. The Holy See could not have granted such a privilege.[441]

---

437   *Papsturkunden*, vol. 1, no. †191, 376–378.

438   *Papsturkunden*, vol. 2, no. †412, 781–785. The most insightful external criticism of this and the previous document is by Beumann, *Theutonum nova metropolis*, 120–138, 166–177 and passim. In my interpretation I follow in the footsteps of this author, who summed up his studies of many years in a book which I quote here and which was published posthumously.

439   *Papsturkunden*, vol. 2, no. 340, 663–664.

440   Thomas Zotz, "Pallium et quaedam episcopatus insignia. Zum Beziehungsgefüge und zu Rangfragen der Reichskirchen im Spiegel der päpstlichen Privilegierung des 10. und 11. Jahrhunderts," in *Festschrift für Berent Schwineköper*, ed. Helmut Maurer and Hans Patze (Sigmaringen: Thorbecke, 1982), 155–175, especially 165–168.

441   Carl Gerold Fürst, *Cardinalis. Prolegomena zu einer Rechtsgeschichte des römischen Kardinalskollegiums* (Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1967), 146 ff.

It is not easy to use verified data, when writing about the cardinals hon-
ouring the liturgy at Magdeburg with their presence. Although there are some
extant papal diplomas mentioning their existence, if they are not notori-
ous forgeries, like the one discussed here, they are rightly regarded as inter-
polated documents. Yet we have to agree that the Holy See did indeed grant
the Archbishop of Magdeburg the privilege of organizing the liturgy after the
Roman fashion. Helmut Beumann has pointed out that, according the false
bull, allegedly issued for Adalbert, which is the subject of the present analysis,
and the interpolated bull for Gisiler, the cardinals are to use the *lisinae* during
the service.[442] This last word means nothing and in order to translate it, we
have to assume that it is a distortion of the noun *listomina* (pl.), which denotes
the maniple. This distortion can be explained provided that the source used
by the forgers was written in the curial script. In Germany people could not
read the curial script and, when copying documents, they often made mis-
takes. If so, however, the original bull must have existed, allowing the cardinals
to be established in Magdeburg cathedral.[443]

Documents bestowing this kind of privilege on German Church institutions
did not usually specify the number of the cardinals. The only exception is the
bull for Aachen mentioned above. (Of course, I am leaving aside two inauthen-
tic bulls for Magdeburg: the one I am dealing with now, and another one that
stems from it.[444]) The Aachen document specifies that the cardinals include
seven priests and seven deacons,[445] while the Magdeburg forgery mentions
twelve priests, seven deacons and twenty-four subdeacons. I have already men-
tioned that in the latter case these numbers are too high. This can be explained
only if we assume that the local clerics were in the throes of rivalry. Since the
Holy See had specified the relevant numbers only for the palace chapel in
Aachen, it was precisely with Aachen that they tried to compete.

There was a moment in history, when Magdeburg felt deeply offended by
the fact that Charlemagne's old capital was favoured. This happened during the
reign of Otto III. While for Otto I the city on the Elbe was his favourite resi-
dence and did much to make it a truly imperial capital, and while Otto II
clearly showed his fondness for Magdeburg, the latter's son showed disrespect

---

442   *Papsturkunden*, vol. 1, no. †191, 377; no. 270, 531.

443   This is the interpolated bull in *Papsturkunden*, vol. 1, no. 270; the *lisinae* can be found in
       the interpolated fragment; see Beumann, *Theutonum nova metropolis*, 187–188.

444   *Papsturkunden*, vol. 2, no. 472, 897 (the relevant fragment is part of the interpolation).

445   *Papsturkunden*, vol. 2, no. 340, 664.

for it. His favourite seat in countries north of the Alps was Aachen[446] (several details concerning this subject are given in Chapter III). We can thus hazard a guess that the analyzed forgery originated during the reign of the last Otto, with the *terminus post quem* falling on 8 February 997 (Gregory V's bull). The document should be seen as a defensive response to the imperial policy aimed at elevating Aachen at the expense of Magdeburg.

The chronological placement of the source in question stems from other premises as well. As I will argue later, it predates the forgery marked by Harald Zimmermann as no. †412, a document that was most likely drafted in 1004.

While some of the instructions included in the document allegedly issued by John XIII for Adalbert concern the cardinal rights of St. Maurice's Cathedral, the remaining part of the document specifies the status of Magdeburg vis-à-vis other metropolitan sees. The forger opted for a peculiar solution: on the one hand, the pope bestows on Adalbert the privilege of primacy over archbishoprics established in Germania, and on the other—he makes him equal to archbishops with sees in Gaul: Cologne, Mainz and Trier.

The Magdeburg cathedral circles did not want to attack the metropolitan sees on the Rhine. The status achieved under the 967 foundation bull—making Magdeburg equal to the oldest archbishoprics—was deemed to be completely satisfactory. The sting of the forgery was directed against other Churches. Unfortunately, their names are not given, but we have the right to believe that Salzburg was not among them, for under the rules of geographic naming observed at the time, the city was located in Noricum. Thus, only Hamburg and Gniezno could be taken into consideration. Einhard defined Germania as territories situated between the Rhine and the Vistula, and this convention was applied in the late 10th and early 11th century. In any case, the Slavic countries, or at least some of them, were placed in Germania. It is enough to refer to the *Life of St. Adalbert*, beginning with the words "Est locus in partibus Germaniae", in which the author, when using the word *locus*, meant Slavic lands.

Magdeburg and Hamburg competed to some degree for missionary territories, as the latter claimed the right of primacy over the northern part of Polabia. These claims were officially recognized, since the diocese founded by Otto I with its see in Oldenburg in Holstein was already during his reign incorporated into the Hamburg church province. However, in the late 10th and the

---

446 Walter Schlesinger, "Zur Geschichte der Magdeburger Königspfalz," in *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Erzbistums Magdeburg*, Studien zur katholischen Bistums- und Klostergeschichte 11 (Leipzig: St. Benno Verlag, 1969), 9–43 (on cardinals as an element of rivalry between Magdeburg and Aachen, 36–39); see also Wolfgang Giese, *Der Stamm der Sachsen und das Reich in ottonischer und salischer Zeit* (Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1979), 100–115.

early 11th century the dispute lost its relevance, because as a result of Slavic risings the Polabian dioceses practically ceased to exist; in addition, Hamburg, with its good prospects of a mission in Scandinavia, had no reason to strain its relations with Magdeburg.

On the other hand, the emergence of the Archbishopric of Gniezno created a new, very dangerous situation. From the point of view of the law, the position of the see on the Elbe did not change. This Church had never exercised any jurisdiction over the Piast territories—neither over those that belonged to Mieszko's state in 968, nor those incorporated later. However, as long as they remained outside the metropolitan system, there was a chance—quite a considerable chance—that the eastern border of the Magdeburg province would be set on the Bug River or the Wieprz River. Even if the status quo were to be maintained, this was convenient for the Magdeburg metropolitan, at least insofar as, in terms of rank, prestige and possibilities, he was superior to the Polish bishop or bishops.

The events of 999–1000 constituted a very hard blow. Henceforth any expansion of jurisdiction to include the Piast dioceses was out of the question. Moreover, the Magdeburg Church had to face a situation in which there were no clear prospects for it to fulfil the tasks for which it had been established. It could not undertake any missions in Poland and any evangelizing activities in Polabia might seemed unrealistic for the foreseeable future. This was compounded by another extremely dangerous circumstance. It looked like the mission among the pagan Slavs living between the Elbe and the Oder would be carried out by Bolesław Chrobry. Indeed, Magdeburg could feel as if its world were collapsing.

The idea of ensuring primacy "in Germania" might have emerged as a rather desperate attempt to defend its position. Gisiler—for, judging by the period in which the forgery was made, he must have been behind the whole undertaking—had no possibilities of opposing the plans to establish a province with Gniezno as its see. There were no legal grounds for him to do so and, what is worse, with deposition looming over him, he could not afford to engage in any determined political manoeuvring. Therefore, he decided to obtain a higher rank for himself, so that he could be superior to his Polish colleague in the hierarchy. He may have hoped this would not only enhance his prestige, but would also bring him some jurisdictional powers, associated, for example, with presiding over synods at which the entire episcopate of "Germania" would be present. The longer version of the falsified document, which is not easy to date, specified that it was to be primacy "in sedendo, in iudicando, in confirmando, in subscribendo, in sententiis dandis".[447] All this suggests a synodal assembly.

---

447   *Papsturkunden*, vol. 1, no. †191, 377.

There is an interesting analogy. In the third quarter of the 11th century Archbishop Adalbert of Hamburg (1043–1072) came up with the idea of establishing a patriarchate of the North with Hamburg as its see. The archbishop's situation was just as awkward as that of Gisiler half a century earlier. In the Scandinavian Churches, which from the very beginning had been part of the Hamburg province, emancipation processes became increasingly visible and, before long, led to the emergence of national provinces. Adalbert was well-aware of these tendencies and he even talked about them with King Sweyn Estridsson of Denmark. He knew well, too, that he was unable to stop these processes. The only possibility for him was to create an organizational entity which would be higher-ranked than the ecclesiastical province and which would be headed by himself.[448] Adalbert's plans, like those of Gisiler before, were not implemented.

The analyzed forgery does not mention the Archbishopric of Gniezno at all. Yet it testifies unequivocally to an opposition to the founding of the Polish church province. This is suggested by the coincidence of timing between the attempt to obtain primacy for the Metropolitan of Magdeburg and the promotion of Gniezno—promotion that was being planned or had just occurred. The coincidence can be explained only by an attempt to minimize the damage caused by the promotion to the metropolitan see on the Elbe.[449]

The other diplomatic source we need to examine here is a draft bull for the Archbishopric of Magdeburg. The draft, prepared in the circles associated with the Cathedral of St. Maurice, was submitted to the Roman Curia for approval

---

448   The analogy was pointed out by Helmut Beumann, "Das päpstliche Schisma von 1130, Lothar III. und die Metropolitanrechte von Magdeburg und Hamburg-Bremen in Polen und Dänemark," in idem, *Wissenschaft vom Mittelalter*, 479–500, especially 489. For more on Adalbert's patriarchate-related plans, see e.g. Horst Fuhrmann, "Studien zur Geschichte mittelalterlichen Patriarchate," *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte. Kanonistische Abteilung* 41 (1955): 120–170; Peter Johanek, "Die Erzbischöfe von Hamburg-Bremen und ihre Kirche im Reich der Salierzeit," in *Die Salier und das Reich*, 105–109. The issue of the subordination of the Scandinavian Church to Hamburg and the emergence of independent church provinces in Scandinavia is discussed by Wolfgang Seegrün, *Das Papsttum und Skandinavien bis zur Vollendung der nordischen Kirchenorganisation (1164)*, Quellen und Forschungen zur Geschichte Schleswig-Holsteins 51 (Neumünster: K. Wachholtz, 1967), passim.

449   I find it hard to agree with Kazimierz Myśliński, who claims that Gisiler did not oppose the establishment of the Archbishopric of Gniezno (Myśliński, "Sprawa ziem połabskich," 17). Opinions similar to Myśliński's were expressed by Pleszczyński, "Bolesław Chrobry konfratrem", 18. On Gisiler's policy with regard to Poland and the Polish Church, see Beumann and Schlesinger, "Urkundenstudien zur deutschen Ostpolitik," 371–392; however, the work was written with the assumption that the draft of the *Papsturkunden* †412 bull emerged around 995.

during John XVIII's pontificate, but was not well received. However, it became the basis for a forgery issued in the name of this pope, a document that has not survived. For some time it was used as the basis for obtaining privileges, this time authentic, from the Holy See.

The draft of John XVIII's bull for Magdeburg does not raise the issue of primacy. Still, a connection with the Gniezno case is clearly there, as the person dictating the document emphatically defends Magdeburg's claims[450] and—what is more—those of the German king to primacy over Poland.

Emperor Otto I, says the author, ordered that bishoprics be founded beyond the Rivers Elbe, Saale and Oder, in the main centres of pagan cult, namely in Zeitz, Meissen, Merseburg, Brandenburg, Havelberg and Poznań. The monarch's will was done. And since the bishops of these dioceses were not subordinated to any metropolitan, the ruler had the Archbishopric of Magdeburg established. On Otto's orders, Adalbert was made archbishop and the emperor's wish was that the new metropolitan and his successors would have the right to ordain the bishops of these new dioceses. Taking advantage of his privilege, Adalbert consecrated Jordan, Bishop of Poznań, Hugo of Zeitz, Burchard of Meissen, Boso of Merseburg, Dodilo of Brandenburg and Udo of Havelberg.

We know for sure that in the 10th century the Bishopric of Poznań did not belong to the Archdiocese of Magdeburg. Authentic papal bulls issued at the time list neither Poznań nor any other Polish city among the dioceses making up the province in question. Nevertheless, the author of the draft states unequivocally that the Diocese of Poznań does belong to the province. According to 10th century documents, the area in which the Archbishopric of Magdeburg operated included territories beyond the Elbe and the Saale. But the was no mention of how far to the east the area extended. To preclude any doubts that it also includes Poland, our author adds the Oder.

He goes even further. He claims that the Bishopric of Poznań was founded by Otto I, thus presenting the emperor as the evangelizer of Poland. According to a political theory, advocated by, among others, Theotmar of Salzburg (whose incumbency came at the turn of the 10th century), secular and ecclesiastical power over a country was exercised by whoever had Christianized it.[451] That is why the vision of history presented here had its far-reaching implications. Poznań belongs to the Magdeburg province, because such was the will of the emperor and his will is law for two reasons: first, he was the one who established the bishopric, second, he Christianized the country in which the diocese is located.

---

450   See e.g. Jedlicki, "La Création," 666–667.

451   *Epistola Theotmari episcopi*, in *Die Conversio Bagoariorum*, 138–156, especially 142.

I have already mentioned that the matter of primacy does not recur in the draft in question. However, we are struck by the following assertion. The author stresses that Otto I ordered bishoprics to be founded in the main centres of pagan cult. What comes to mind here is Pseudo-Isidore's theory whereby the rank of local Churches depended on whether pagan priests had their seats there and on their rank. The author does not say that idols were worshiped in Magdeburg itself. Nevertheless, the suggestion is that if it has authority over towns which in pre-Christian times played an important role in religious life, it deserves a very high rank in the church hierarchy—who knows, perhaps even that of a patriarchate.

The bull bestowed a number of privileges on the Archbishop of Magdeburg, privileges making him stand out among other metropolitans. He had the right to be preceded by a cross in a procession, the liturgy at the altar of St. Maurice was to be celebrated by cardinals, and he himself was included in the community of Roman cardinals. Of particular significance is the claim that beginning with Adalbert, each Archbishop of Magdeburg is under the care (*mundiburdium*) of St. Peter and his vicar. In the 9th century there emerged a custom according to which the Holy See took selected monasteries under its care. However, in the 9th-10th century there was no instance of the Holy See granting its protection to a bishopric. Thus, in this case, too, the author of the draft bull went beyond the actual state of affairs. He knew, of course, that the Monastery of St. Maurice had been granted the Holy See's protection at the very beginning of its history, which he certainly regarded as a point of reference for his claims, but must have been well-aware of the crucial difference between papal protection of a monastery and papal protection of an archbishopric. Ideas of the Magdeburg circles in this respect evolved in the atmosphere created by the restitution of the Diocese of Merseburg. In order to prevent another dissolution, in 1004 Henry II obtained the protection of the Holy See for this bishopric. Later, he got the papal *mundiburdium* for his beloved foundation, namely the Bishopric of Bamberg.

The matter we are examining was very closely linked to the Gniezno question. When writing about the protection granted to Adalbert and his successors, the author uses terms that leave the reader in no doubt: papal protection refers to the rights of the Archbishop of Magdeburg as a metropolitan, and these include his primacy over Poznań.

All these facts are given in an extensive narrative, with the idea being that when authenticating the bull, the pope on his part will sanction them legally. However, there is a narrative source in the full meaning of the term, describing the same events to some extent. I mean here the *Gesta Archiepiscoporum Magdeburgensium*. There, too, we can read that Otto I ordered that bishoprics

be founded in centres of pagan cult, namely in Zeitz, Meissen, Merseburg, Brandenburg, Havelberg and Poznań. However, there are differences between the two accounts. The author of the *Gesta* also believes that the Archbishop of Magdeburg was granted authority over the territories extending beyond the Elbe and the Saale; the name of the Oder does not appear here, however. The historiographer lists bishops consecrated by Adalbert, but does not mention Jordan of Poznań among them.[452]

This can be seen as evidence of the fact that the relevant fragment of the work was written earlier than the draft bull. Having the list of bishops consecrated by Adalbert before him, there was no reason for the historiographer to shorten it. After all, his view was that Poznań was part of the Magdeburg province. Similarly, why he should have omitted the Oder, if he agreed that the authority of the archbishopric the history of which he was writing reached far beyond this river. As I wrote in Chapter 1, the *Gesta Archiepiscoporum Magde burgensium* in its present form emerged in the 12th century, but the facts presented here demonstrate that the work was based on an earlier text.

The author of the latter knew the forgery I have just commented on, *Papsturkunden* †191. We know this from the fact that when describing the papal privilege concerning the liturgy celebrated by cardinals, he cited the same unbelievably high number of clerics participating in services. Thus, we come across a dating criterion. The original version of the history of the Bishops of Magdeburg must have been written after 8 February 997, the date on which the Aachen bull was issued. If so, the draft bull *Papsturkunden* †412, containing quotes from the *Gesta Archiepiscoporum Magdeburgensium*, must be even later.

It is almost certain that the draft in question was written after Otto III's death. It would be difficult to image that during the reign of this monarch, the author of the draft, which, after all, was supposed to end up on the pope's desk (it would have been Sylvester II's in this case), dared to write that Otto I was the greatest of the Ottonians. It was fitting to be praising the grandfather, but not at the expense of the grandson, a great emperor himself. There is no doubt that the draft was drawn up before John XIX's bull for Archbishop Humfried, dated 1026–1027.[453] I have already mentioned that the document in question represents a new way of thinking and arguing. Whereas before, beginning with John XIII's 967 bull, the authors tried to defend the position of the Archbishopric of Magdeburg, emphasizing the fact that its dignity was

---

452   *Gesta Archiepiscoporum Magdeburgensium*, cap. 9–10, 381–382.

453   *Papsturkunden*, vol. 2, no. 567, 1073–1074. See Beumann, *Theutonum nova metropolis*, 202.

equal to that of other archbishoprics, above all those on the Rhine.[454] in this document a completely different notion of equality is introduced: Magdeburg is "equal" to Rome, that is, similar in its customs to Rome, thanks to, among others, the liturgy celebrated by cardinals. This line of reasoning was certainly unknown to the author of the draft bull *Papsturkunden* †412, who tried to collect as many facts as possible testifying to the greatness of his Church. There is no doubt that otherwise he would have used the idea in some way.[455]

Helmut Beumann has attempted to establish the date of the writing of the draft very precisely.[456] He has noted that the dictation of the bull by John XVIII for the Church of Our Lady in Isernia of October 1004[457] suggests a borrowing of the wording from a bull by Stephen VIII for the monastery of St. Maurice in Magdeburg. This last document, taking the monastery under papal care, has not survived, but its content as well as, partially, the dictation can be reconstructed. We also know that in 1004 Henry II obtained in Rome a bull for the Bishopric of Merseburg, which was being revived at the time. The bull—again, reconstructed—took the diocese under the care of the Holy See. Beumann's argument, to put it rather simply, is as follows: if in October 1004 Stephen VIII's bull for the Magdeburg monastery was seen in the Roman Curia, then it would seem that when discussing Merseburg's case, the German envoys tried to obtain protection also for Magdeburg. That is why Stephen VIII's bull was submitted to the Curia—although the bull granted protection not to the archbishopric but to the Monastery of St. Maurice, it did, nevertheless, provide an argument. On the other hand, we know that the draft bull *Papsturkunden* †412, which is the focus of our interest, was drawn up in order to obtain the Holy See's *mundiburdium*. The most logical assumption would be that the draft was produced for the envoys who in 1004 set out for Rome.

---

454   See Chapter I, point 2.

455   The draft in question is dated usually by a reference to the fact that it was used by the forger who fabricated Benedict VIII's bull for Archbishop Walthar, dated 27 August 1012 (*Papsturkunden*, vol. 2, no. 472, 896–898). This has been demonstrated by H. Beumann (Beumann and Schlesinger, "Urkundenstudien zur deutschen Ostoplitik," 332–344, 353–371). However, the problem is that it is not quite easy to date the forgery. There are noteworthy, though perhaps not decisive, arguments indicating that the document was fabricated during the incumbency of Archbishop Gero. In such a case, the date of his death (1023) would have to be regarded as the *terminus ante quem* of the draft bull *Papsturkunden* †412 (Claude, *Geschichte des Erzbistums Magdeburg*, 292, fn. 72; Beumann, *Theutonum nova metropolis*, 199).

456   Beumann, *Theutonum nova metropolis*, 120–138. Starting from different premises, Labuda is in favour of this dating, *Studia*, vol. 2, 514–523.

457   *Papsturkunden*, vol. 2, no. 416, 791–792.

While the forged bull by John XIII was made during Gisiler's pontificate, the other source analyzed here came to being probably during the incumbency of the next Archbishop of Magdeburg, Tagino, who assumed his office in early 1004 and held it until his death in 1012.[458] This dignitary, too, was against the Gniezno order. This was one of the reasons why he sought to obtain the Holy See's permission to incorporate Poznań into his province. We have to be aware of the fact that, as Thietmar explains, before 1000 this bishopric comprised the territory which became part of the Archbishopric of Gniezno. In such a situation Tagino, as the metropolitan with authority over the diocese which suffered as a result of the foundation, would have at his disposal legal instruments that would allow him to question the very existence of the Polish church province. These would be maximum objectives, very difficult to achieve. However, the very presence on the Warta offered good prospects for Magdeburg.

The opposition to the Gniezno developments in Magdeburg is evident from other sources as well. Both the anonymous author of the oldest version of the *Gesta Archiepiscoporum Magdeburgensium*[459] and Thietmar[460] claim that Jordan, Bishop of Poznań, was a suffragan bishop of the Magdeburg see. Both sources reflect the atmosphere during Tagino's pontificate. Moreover, the Merseburg chronicler also counts Unger as a suffragan bishop of the Magdeburg see (specifically: suffragan bishop of Archbishop Tagino).[461] In this case the author was writing about contemporary events and for his contemporaries. What he wrote was most likely true. In 1000 Unger was not a suffragan bishop of the Magdeburg see, so he must have become one later, most probably after he was imprisoned in Magdeburg on his way to Rome. We do not know whether he was forced to accept obedience to Magdeburg or whether he accepted it voluntarily. One thing is clear, though: Tagino indeed sought to subordinate Poznań to himself.[462]

---

458   Some say that the draft could not have been drawn up during the pontificate of the Archbishop of Mainz Willigis (975–1011), because it made Magdeburg incumbents equal to Mainz metropolitans; such a view has been recently expressed in Polish historiography by S. Trawkowski, "Początki Kościoła w Polsce", 64. Aside from the fact that it is a draft of a document the objective of which was to change the existing legal situation, we need to underline that equality between the Archbishopric of Magdeburg and other archbishoprics was guaranteed already in John XIII's foundation bull; I have written about it in Chapter I, point 2.

459   Cap. 9, 381.

460   Thietmar, lib. II, cap. 32, 64.

461   Thietmar, lib. VI, cap. 65, 356.

462   Labuda, *Studia*, vol. 2, 514–523.

If the reconstruction of events proposed by Beumann is correct, Tagino's campaign must have been supported by Henry II. We do not know whether their plans in the Gniezno case were identical; this is rather doubtful. However, the subordination of Poznań to Magdeburg must have suited the king as must the idea that a German ruler was the founder of the first Polish diocese. The ideological consequences of such a theory could have been far-reaching, as we know.

8   Summing Up

Gniezno was not a city with ancient roots and the local Church was not established in Apostolic times. Everyone knew this and no one tried to make reality more beautiful by circulating a legend or two. We need to bear in mind that this fact weakened the position of the advocates of the Archbishopric of Gniezno, when its foundation was being planned, and the position of the archbishopric itself, when it already existed. We remember the concern of the Magdeburg Church over the fact that it could not boast ancient roots. Gniezno's situation was all the more inconvenient given the fact that the creation of a new province seriously jeopardized the interests of German metropolitan sees, especially Magdeburg and Mainz. And the latter referred to the tradition of not only St. Boniface, but also that of St. Theonistus, an bishop and martyr living in Antiquity, whom some even considered to have been a disciple of St. Paul.[463]

We do not know the details of the discussions and polemics surrounding the founding of the Polish church province. However, we can imagine that the existence of the Archbishopric of Magdeburg from a certain point of view put the Gniezno question in—paradoxically—a more positive light. For if a province could be established with its metropolitan see in a city that had just been founded, if an archbishopric could be established *in cruda radice*, that is, in a location which had never been a bishopric and the ecclesiastical origins of which were very recent, then the see of a church province could just as well be located in Gniezno.[464] It certainly deserved to be called a city. The term *civitas* was used with reference to it by Otto III in a document issued in Gniezno,[465]

463   Staab, "Die Mainzer Kirche," 53–55.

464   This aspect was raised by Wolfgang Huschner in his paper delivered on 7 May 2003 in Quedlinburg during a conference entitled *Von den Wurzeln zum Neuen Europa. Hoftag in Quedlinburg 973*.

465   DO III, no. 349, 779.

with Bruno of Querfurt even using the expression *civitas magna*.[466] After all, Gniezno was the capital of a great and powerful dukedom, it had strong fortifications and at least two churches, and not so long ago had been a centre of pagan cult.[467]

Attempts were made to strengthen Magdeburg's weak position by obtaining extraordinary privileges from the pope, privileges not encountered anywhere else. Their aim was to put the new metropolitan see on a par with the oldest and the most venerable archbishoprics. On the other hand, an argument in favour of Gniezno was the holiness and work of St. Adalbert. His mission earned him the Archbishopric of Gniezno and he himself was buried in the local archcathedral. It was important that the saint was regarded as an apostle. For could the metropolitan status of a Church possessing the body of an apostle be questioned?

However, the Archbishopric of Gniezno was not established only to venerate Adalbert, but also to continue his work. This created a dangerous situation for the neighbouring church provinces, because the mission which the Polish Church wanted to carry out was directed also to territories belonging to foreign provinces. It was dangerous also because the Polish Church was led by a powerful ruler, who had powers granted to him by the emperor.

---

466   *Adalberti Vita II*, cap. 24, 29.

467   Tomasz Sawicki, "Wczesnośredniowieczny zespół grodowy w Gnieźnie," in *Gniezno w świetle ostatnich badań archeologicznych*, ed. Zofia Kurnatowska, Poznańskie Towarzystwo Przyjaciół Nauk. Wydział Historii i Nauk Społecznych. Prace Komisji Archeologicznej 21 (Poznań: Wydawnictwo Poznańskiego Towarzystwa Przyjaciół Nauk, 2001), 87–126, especially 90–92 and 113–118; idem, "Badania przy kościele św. Jerzego w Gnieźnie," in ibid., 163–186, especially 180–184.

Otto III's Political Thought and Spirituality

1   *Renovatio Imperii Romanorum* and its Religious Premises

No political treatises were written in Ottonian times. Ideas concerning the nature of public authority, its tasks and origins found their privileged manifestation in iconographic sources, primarily in miniatures depicting Ottonian rulers, as well as in royal and imperial seals. Many of the miniatures, which adorned or still adorn liturgical books, have survived to this day and their iconography has a rich ideological content. Nevertheless, when trying to interpret them, scholars come up against serious difficulties. They stem from the fact that these historical objects cannot always be precisely dated; sometimes there are doubts which ruler they portray: Otto II or Otto III, Otto III or perhaps Henry II. The seals have poorer iconography, but their chronology is usually not problematic, because the documents on which they can be found have dates.

This is one of the reasons why seals provide ample possibilities for research reconstructing Otto III's political thought. This material, covering his entire reign, allows researchers not only to capture particular elements of the monarch's political thinking but also to reconstruct its evolution. It would not be an exaggeration to say that from this point of view seals are an indispensable source.

When the young monarch began his personal rule in 995, he used a type of seal introduced in 985, during the regency of the Empress Mother, Theophanu.[1] The type in question depicted the ruler's bust *en face*, with a sceptre in one hand and an orb in the other, and drew on Otto II's imperial seal, with the exception being that, in accordance with the actual state of affairs, the inscription on the seal was: OTTO D(E)I GRACIA REX, stressing the royal and not the imperial

---

[1] Sigillographic material from the Carolingian and Ottonian periods is examined by Schramm, *Die deutschen Kaiser*; see also idem, "Drei Nachträge zu den Metallbullen der karolingischen und sächsischen Kaiser," *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters* 24 (1968): 1–15, especially from 5; Hagen Keller, "Zu Siegeln der Karolinger und Ottonnen. Urkunden als "Hoheitszeichen" in der kommunikation des Königs mit seinen Getreuen," *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 32 (1998): 400–441. For information about Otto III's wax seals and *bullae*, see Schramm, *Die deutschen Kaiser*, 80–82, 199–200; Görich, *Otto III.*, 199–202, 267–270; Hagen Keller, "Die Siegel und Bullen Ottos III.," in *Europas Mitte um 1000*, vol. 2, 767–773. My argument is based on Keller's study, cited in the footnote as the last.

dignity of the person issuing the document. The first changes came only with Otto III's Roman coronation (21 May 996); from that moment on until the end of the reign a few years later, the chancellery used several different types of seals.

The first, carrying the inscription †OTTO D(E)I GRATIA ROMANORV(M) IMP(ERATOR) AVG(VSTVS), depicts the entire figure of the monarch, *en face*, standing on a hill, it would seem, and holding the insignia of power: staff and orb. What strikes us is the novelty of the inscription and the iconography. For the first time in the history of Liudolfingian sigillography the imperial titles include a devotional formula, and for the first time the inscription specifies that the emperor in the seal is the emperor of the Romans. Both the father and the grandfather of Otto III were satisfied with the term *imperator* without the expression *Romanorum*. For the first time, too, the whole figure of the monarch is presented, undoubtedly in reference to Byzantine models. The meaning of these innovations seems clear: this was about highlighting the Roman nature of Otto III's empire and, at the same time, emphasizing the fact that the imperial dignity came from God himself. This seal was used to authenticate documents for about ten months.

In mid-April 997 the chancellery introduced a new seal, which was of very high artistic value. When it comes to its iconography it is seemingly not very different from its predecessor. There are, however, two differences: the figure of the ruler is more clearly placed on a hill and the robe he is wearing is presented as if it were moved by wind. Referring to examples from Ottonian miniature paintings and low-reliefs, Hagen Keller is inclined to believe that the "wind motif" is a symbol of God's presence. Thus the author who created the seal wanted to illustrate the truth that the emperor was in direct contact with the sacred and reigned assisted by higher powers.[2] On the other hand, by placing the figure of the monarch on a hill he must have wanted to say that the person of the emperor brought together heaven and earth.[3] It is possible that the iconographic motifs listed here were Otto III's response to the events unfolding in Rome.[4] In February 997 rebels removed Gregory V, made pope following the emperor's order, and elected an antipope in the person of

---

2   Keller, "Die Siegel und Bullen Ottos III.," 770–771.

3   A Christological interpretation of the motif is possible as well: the emperor—image of Christ—is shown as the giant from Psalm 18, whom Christian exegesis interpreted as the figure of the Saviour; see Chiara Frugoni, "L'ideologia del potere imperiale nella "Cattedra di S. Pietro," *Bullettino dell'Istituto Storico Italiano per il Medioevo* 86 (1976–77): 67–181, especially 101–105.

4   This is a view expressed by Keller, "Die Siegel und Bullen Ottos III.," 771.

Johannes Philagathos. In the light of the message carried by the iconography of the new seal, the deed committed by the Romans may have seemed unlawful and sacrilegious.

In October 997 the chancellery introduced yet another change. From then on the seal featured the emperor on the throne, wearing a crown and holding a sceptre and an orb. This is the oldest example in the history of medieval sigillography of majestic representation. Neither Otto III's predecessors nor emperors reigning in Constantinople had been presented in this manner. If we were to look for analogies in older sigillographic material, we could only point to the figure of Christ on the throne, a representation featured on the obverse of Byzantine *bullae*.[5] Indeed: this motif may have been used to show the emperor as a vicar of Christ, who could fulfil his mission because he was like the Son of God.[6] It is worth noting in this context that in the analyzed image the monarch is holding the sceptre and the orb as if he had just received them from heaven.

Six months later imperial sigillography saw a significant breakthrough. Usually, the Carolingians and then Saxon rulers used wax seals on parchment to authenticate documents. Sometimes, however, they ordered that lead seals be made and attached to diplomas to add greater splendour to them. The *bullae* that have survived to this day include those of Charlemagne, Lothar I, Louis II, Charles the Bald, Louis III the Younger and Arnulf. Louis the Pious's *bulla* is also known but only from images. On the other hand, written sources allow us to conclude that metal seals were sometimes used by Otto I and his son Otto II. However, this happened very rarely.

Initially, Otto III's chancellery used only wax seals. This was the case before the imperial coronation and for nearly two years after the coronation. A change came during the second Italian campaign. Beginning with a diploma issued on 22 April 998 in Rome, the monarch would seal his documents only with *bullae*.

There were two kinds of these *bullae*. The first featured an image of a man in profile, with facial hair and a crown, and the inscription OTTO IMPERATOR AUGUSTUS on the obverse. The reverse had a bust of a woman with a shield and a spear leaning on her arm, as well as the inscription RENOVATIO IMPERII ROMANORUM. The woman may have been a personification of Rome or an allegory of the emperor victorious power. Imperial documents were sealed

---

5   An overview of Byzantine political iconography is provided by Catherine Jolivet-Lévy, "L'Image du pouvoir dans l'art byzantin à l'époque de la dynastie macédonienne (867–1056)," *Byzantion* 57 (1987), 441–470.

6   For information about the king as an image of Christ in Otto III's ideology, see my remarks: Michałowski, "Otto III w obliczu ideowego wyzwania," 57–72.

with this kind of *bulla* until the end of 1000.[7] In early 1001 the second type of *bullae* began to be used exclusively. They are small and their obverse features an image of a male head in profile, with no insignia of power accompanying this representation. There is an inscription which reads ROMA AUREA. The reverse has only the inscription ODDO I(M)PERATOR ROMANOR(UM).[8]

Otto III's *bullae* were a vehicle of a distinctive ideology. It was contained in the very fact that they were used by the monarch. Metal seals, made of gold or lead, had been used by Byzantine emperors as well as the greatest rulers of the Christian West following their example (and using almost exclusively lead seals). Thus, by introducing this innovation into his chancellery, Otto III might have wanted to place himself on a par with these monarchs. Worthy of note is the fact that while kings and emperors of the West used metal seals only in exceptional circumstances, he himself used them systematically. From the spring of 998 onwards he did not use wax seals at all.

It has also been pointed out that the image representing the youthful monarch as a mature man with facial hair, seen in the earlier *bulla*, is a copy of the image of Charlemagne from the latter's royal *bulla*.[9] What is probably another example of imitation is the motto referring to renewal of the Roman Empire. We know that an almost identical inscription—RENOVATIO ROMAN(I) IMPERII[10]—was placed on Charlemagne's imperial *bulla*. Thus, Otto, in using an older-type metal seal, consciously referred to the person and work of his famous predecessor.[11] If we leave aside Charlemagne's seal mentioned earlier, the motto found on the first type of *bulla* had no exact analogy in Carolingian sigillography (the closest equivalent we have is the inscription on Charles the Bald's seal: RENOVATIO REGNI FRANCORUM)[12] and had not been known at all in Saxon sigillography before.

---

7   For more on this seal, see, in addition to works listed in fn. 1, Schramm, *Kaiser, Rom und Renovatio*, 117.

8   Schramm, "Drei Nachträge zu den Metallbullen," 13–15.

9   Schramm, *Die deutschen Kaiser*, 81–82. We cannot be absolutely sure as to whether it is Charlemagne's or perhaps Charles the Bald's *bulla*, see Hagen Keller, "Die Ottonen und Karl der Grosse," *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 34 (2000) fn. 63 on p. 126. But even if the second attribution were to be correct, the choice made by Otto III would still be significant. Rejecting the iconographic models of his direct predecessors, the German ruler used a Carolingian *bulla* representing a king Charles. It is in any case likely that he believed him to be Charlemagne.

10   Schramm, "Drei Nachträge zu den Metallbullen," 7–10, with an analysis of the ideological context in which Charlemagne used the motto in question.

11   Keller, "Die Ottonen," 126.

12   Schramm, *Die deutschen Kaiser*, no. 34, 165.

Experts on the subject hold the artistic values of Otto III's seal in high regard. We are all the more perplexed by the second type of the bulla, which is made with far lesser care and which is rather small—less than half the size of the previous type. Only one explanation of this extraordinary fact comes to mind: the seal in question was supposed to be modelled on papal *bullae*, which were characteristically small.[13] There is another factor supporting this hypothesis. Like the papal *bullae*, the obverse of the second imperial bulla has only the name of the ruler, without any image.

A question now arises: from the ideological point of view, did Otto III's *bullae*, taken as a whole, constitute a novelty as compared to the sigillographic legacy left by the chancellery of the ruler in question, and if so, to what extent? I have already written about the significance of the introduction of metal as a raw material. Here I should point to a stronger emphasis on Roman elements, primarily thanks to the formulae of *Renovatio Imperii Romanorum* and *Roma Aurea*, and thanks to the use of an allegory of Rome. Even if we wanted to see in this female figure not an allegory of the Eternal City, but a personification of the imperial "victory", we would still have to admit that the symbolism of the *bulla* was within the sphere of ancient images of pagan Roman origins.

At the same time Christian religious references disappeared. The titles stamped on the metal seals lack a devotional formula, and the iconography of the *bulla* does not clearly refer to the sacred as understood by Christianity. This is in sharp contrast to the earlier seals of the same ruler. Of course, it would be a mistake to conclude that over the last few years of his reign Otto III's political thought became detached from the ecclesiastical interpretation of imperial power. We know from other sources that such a process did not occur. On the contrary, towards the end of his reign, the monarch put a stronger emphasis on the religious nature of his office than ever. However, we should note the peculiar nature of this iconography and shall return to it later on in the book.

What comes to the fore is a different issue: how we should understand the meaning which in the last few years of his reign the emperor attributed to the Roman ideology? In particular, what was behind the motto *Renovatio Imperii Romanorum*?[14]

---

13   Gougenheim, *Les fausses terreurs*, 139; Keller, "Die Siegel und Bullen Ottos III.," 772.

14   Concerning the idea of a renewal of the Empire according to Otto III and those close to him, scholars express widely differing views; see first of all Schramm, *Kaiser, Rom und Renovatio*, vol. 1, especially 87–187; Görich, "Otto III.," 187–274 and passim; Aleksander Gieysztor, *L'Europe nouvelle autour de l'an mil. La papauté, l'empire et les "nouveaux venus"*, Unione internazionale degli istituti di archeologia, storia e storia dell'arte di Roma. Conferenze 13 (Rome, 1997), 35–40; Althoff, *Otto III.*, 114–125. Also Robert Folz,

There are several sources that can help us here. One of them is *Versus de Gregorio et Ottone Augusto*.[15] This work was written in the spring of 998, after Gregory v was put back on Peter's Throne, that is, more or less at a time when the imperial chancellery introduced the *bulla* with the inscription in question. It was written by a confidant of the young monarch, Leo, who soon became Bishop of Vercelli. The manuscript of the poem contains neumes, which suggests that it was meant to be sung in public. There is a refrain recurring every second verse:

> Christe, preces intellege, Romam tuam respice,
> Romanos pie renova, vires Romę excita.
> Surgat Roma imperio sub Otto tertio.[16]

The major motif in the refrain is Roman renewal. The poet asks Christ to "renew" Romans, to stimulate the forces of the City, and to give it power and authority. The author hopes that all this will happen during Otto iii's reign.

The remaining verses allow us to figure out what Leo meant when he wrote about a renewal. Thus, we learn that the pope restores Roman laws. As a result, Rome again becomes Rome and Otto becomes the glory of the Empire.

"L'Interprétation de l'Empire ottonien," in *Occident et Orient au xe. Actes du ixe Congrès de la Société des Historiens Médiévaux de l'Enseignement Supérieur Public* (*Dijon, 2–4 juin 1978*) (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1979), 13–17; John William Bernhardt, "Der Herrscher im Spiegel der Urkunden: Otto iii. und Heinrich ii. im Vergleich," in *Otto iii.—Heinrich ii. eine Wende?*, 327–348, especially 331–332; Eickhoff, *Kaiser Otto iii.*, 203–218, 260–262, 308–320; David A. Warner, "Ideas and Action in the Reign of Otto iii," *Journal of Medieval History* 25 (1999): 1–18; Strzelczyk, *Otton iii*, 98–110; Bertrand Fauvarque, "Sylvestre ii et Otto iii: politique, réforme et utopie, aspects eschatologique," in *Gerberto d'Aurillac da Abate di Bobbio a Papa dell'Anno 1000*, 545–596; Heinrich Dormeier, "Die Renovatio Imperii Romanorum und die "Aussenpolitik" Ottos iii. und seiner Berater," in *Polen und Deutschland*, 163–191.

15 Ed. Karl Strecker, *mgh* Poetae Latini, vol. 5, part 2 (Berlin: Weidmann, 1939), 477–480 ("Christ, hear our prayers, look favourably on Rome, your city, restore lovingly the strength of the Romans, arouse the vigour of Rome. Let Rome rise to power under Otto iii"). The poem is commented on by Bloch, "Beiträge zur Geschichte des Bischofs Leo," 82–83 and 109–115; Ter Braak, *Kaiser Otto iii.*, 117–122, 148–152; Schramm, *Kaiser, Rom und Renovatio*, vol. 1, 120–127; Görich, "Otto iii.", 198–199; Althoff, *Otto iii.*, 118–119; Eduard Hlawitschka, "Kaiser Otto iii., der "Jüngling, der Grosses, ja sogar Unmögliches ersann","" in *Schriften der Sudetendeutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften und Künste*, vol. 20, Vorträge und Abhandlungen aus geisteswissenschaftlichen Bereichen (Munich: Verlag-Haus Sudetenland, 1999), 48–50; Dormeier, "Die Renovatio Imperii Romanorum," 169–172.

16 *Versus de Gregorio*, 477.

In addition, the poet states that Gregory leads the Churches, that he creates one people out of the various individuals,[17] that he is the teacher of all people and that he has the power to bind and release with regard to souls. On the other hand, continues Leo, the emperor, who has the power over bodies, uses an invincible sword to punish the sinners. All Churches, even the ancient Sees of Antioch and Alexandria, recognize Gregory's authority, while golden Greece and iron Babylonia in fear and humility serve Otto, who rules the whole world. Drawing on the emperor's power, the Bishop of Rome cleanses the world of evil. At the end, the poet calls Otto and Gregory two torches, and asks them to illuminate Churches all over the world—one with the sword, the other with the word.

Let us note first that not only in the refrain, but also in other fragments do we see phraseology bringing to mind renewal. The pope re-establishes, *recreat*, laws that, after all, were once in force, and restores, *reparat*, Rome to the state in which it was in the past. Secondly, we should note that there were several aspects to this renewal. It involved bringing order to the City and enabling the papacy and the empire again to act in order to fight evil and spread goodness. The two institutions were universal. They fulfilled their role with regard to the whole world, and their authority was recognized by all Churches and all countries. According to Leo of Vercelli, a renewal of Rome with all its world implications was taking place thanks to a close collaboration between Gregory and Otto. However, the reader cannot help thinking that the author places a stronger emphasis on the role of the pope. It is he, not the emperor, who restores Rome to its former state, it is he who restores laws allowing the emperor to achieve glory, it is he around whom people gather, it is he who carries out the salvific work with regard to souls, while the ruler has power only over the bodies. Of course, Leo readily agreed with the view that the pope was able to carry out his work only because he was under the monarch's protection: Gregory was made Bishop of Rome by Otto and is able to fight iniquity only thanks to the fact that the imperial power is behind him. "Sub caesaris potentia—wrote the poet—purgat papa saecula".[18]

---

17 This may be the meaning of the expression *componis populum* from verse 5: "...es in ecclesiis, in sanctis misteriis. / Tu [sc. Gregorius] es magister omnium, tu componis populum; /...as reddis varias, ligas, solvis animas" (*Versus de Gregorio*, 479).

18 *Versus de Gregorio*, verse 10, 479 ("With Caesar's power the pope cleanses the world"). This dialectic way of writing prompts medievalists to give different answers to the question about whose role—the pope's or the emperor's—is more important according to the poet; cf. fragments of works by Schramm, Görich and Dormeier indicated in fn. 15; it is also worth adding Uhlirz's opinion, *Otto III.*, 269, as well as that of Robert Folz, *L'Idée*

The problem could be formulated as follows: the essence of the matter is up to the pope, the emperor's role is just to make sure that the external conditions allow the religious authority to carry our its work. Undoubtedly, we are dealing here with a certain lack of balance between the two powers, yet the fact should not be stressed too much, simply because our impression may stem partly from a wrong perspective. The author constantly addresses Gregory, so it is his role, not that of the emperor, that he tries to enhance first of all.

Authors of the literature on the subject sometimes point out that Leo of Vercelli's poem contains reminiscences, as it were, from the second chapter of the Book of Daniel[19] and, consequently, references to the theory defined as *translatio Imperii*.[20] When listing foreign powers serving Otto, the poet writes about iron Babylonia and golden Greece, with the predicates "iron" and "golden" being particularly thought-provoking.

This is not a view that could be rejected without any discussion. We have to be aware of the fact that in the 10th century people sometimes devoted themselves to this type of reflection in the Carolingian successor-states. In a work written in 949–954, Adso of Montier-en-Der, wondering about the coming of the Antichrist, lists three powers succeeding each other: Greece, Persia and the greatest of them—Rome, ruling all the countries and nations of the world. The Antichrist will come, when all kingdoms are severed from that last power. Adso explains straight away that this will not happen soon, for although the *Imperium Romanum* has been largely destroyed, it is still there thanks to the fact that it is in the hands of the kings of the Franks. As long as they continue to live, Rome's dignity will last. Readers then learn that one of the Frankish kings will again possess the *Imperium Romanum* as a whole and after a happy reign will place his sceptre and his crown on the Mount of Olives in Jerusalem. This will mark the end of the Empire of the Romans and the Christians, which will be followed by the times of the Antichrist.[21]

---

d'Empire en Occident du Vᵉ au XIVᵉ siècle (Paris: Aubier, 1953), 202, whose impression after reading the poem was different from mine: "Cette rénovation sera effectuée par les deux pouvoirs suprêmes du monde, les deux Luminaires, agissant en étroite coopération. Le plus considérable des deux est cependant l'empereur, source et appui de la papauté, porteur du glaive temporel qui permet de remplir sa mission".

19   Schramm, *Kaiser, Rom und Renovatio*, vol. 1, 123; cf. however, the reservations expressed by the editor of *Versus de Gregorio*, 479 (fn. to verse 8).

20   See Görich, "Otto III.", 198–199.

21   Adso Dervensis, *De ortu et tempore Antichristi necnon tractus, qui ab eo dependunt*, ed. Daniël Verhelst, Corpus Christianorum. Continuatio Mediaevalis 45 (Turnhoult: Brepols, 1976), 20–29, especially 25–26. For more on Adso's treatise, see Robert Konrad, *De ortu et tempore Antichristi. Antichristvorstellung und Geschichtsbild des Adso von*

We cannot, of course, rule out that Leo of Vercelli referred to these or similar views when writing that Otto III ruled the whole world. In such a case he would have placed the monarch's reign in a broad historiosophical and eschatological perspective, regarding Otto as the emperor of the end of time. The renewal of Rome about which he wrote would have sounded particularly strong, and the reign of the current monarch over the whole world would have been understood by the poet very much literally: Otto III would soon perform the basic acts of power with regard to all peoples and all kingdoms.

However, such an interpretation does not seem highly likely, because the work in question lacks a clear indication that the time announced in the Apocalypse was near.[22] For this reason we should accept instead that the author

---

Montier-en-Der, Münchener Historische Studien. Abteilung Mittelalterliche Geschichte 1 (Kallmünz/Opf.: Lassleben, 1964); see also Horst Dieter Rauh, *Das Bild des Antichrist im Mittelalter: von Tyconius zum deutschen Symbolismus*, Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie und Theologie des Mittelalters, Neue Folge 9 (Münster: Aschendorff Verlag, 1973, 153–164; Daniël Verhelst, "La Préhistoire des conceptions d'Adson concernant l'Antichrist," *Recherches de Théologie Ancienne et Médiévale* 40 (1973): 52–103, especially 100–103; Johannes Fried, "Endzeiterwartung um die Jahrtausendwende," *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters* 45 (1989): 419–422, the entire article 381–473; Gougenheim, *Les Fausses terreurs*, 78–88 and passim; Hannes Möhring, *Der Weltkaiser der Endzeit. Entstehung, Wandel und Wirkung einer tausendjährigen Weissagung*, Mittelalter-Forschungen 3 (Stuttgart: Thorbecke, 2000), 144–148. For more on Adso's political thinking, see Karl Ferdinand Werner, "Der Autor der Vita sanctae Chrothildis. Ein Beitrag zur Idee der "heiligen" Königin und des Römischen Reiches im x. Jahrhundert," *Mittellateinisches Jahrbuch* 24/25 (1991): 517–551. On the reception in Otto III's milieu of Adso's doctrine concerning the coming of the Antichrist, see Reinhard Wenskus, *Studien zur historisch-politischen Gedankenwelt Bruns von Querfurt*, Mitteldeutschen Forschungen 5 (Münster and Cologne: Böhlau, 1956), 96–101.

22 Görich believes that such an indication is in the fragment mentioning that Christ liberates the world ("Otto III.," 199). However, this expression is unclear and can be interpreted in a variety of ways. I will gladly admit that in some scholars' opinion Otto III believed that the end of time was coming near and shaped his policy accordingly; see e.g. Fried, "Endzeiterwartung," 428–431; Georges Duby, *Rok tysięczny* (translation from the French edition, 1980), Warsaw, 1997, pp. 34–35; Fauvarque, "Sylvestre II et Otto III," 553–556; Oliver Ramonat, "Christianisierung und Endzeiterwartung", in *Europas Mitte um 1000*, 792–797; Fried, *Święty Wojciech*, 40–41; Leszek Wojciechowski, "Symboliczne aspekty Zjadu Gnieźnieńskiego", *Zeszyty Naukowe Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego* 43 (2000) no. 1–2: 20–21. The same view with regard to Henry II is defended by Werner Freitag, "Heinrich II.—ein Kaiser der letzten Tage? Ein Beitrag zur historischen Anthropologie," *Historische Anthropologie* 6 (1998): 217–241. However, I cannot help thinking that arguments given in these and other studies are too weak to prove the hypothesis in question. The view has recently been firmly rejected by Gougenheim, *Les Fausses terreurs*, 136–145.

meant simply a kind of hegemony or leadership in the world which Otto was regaining or was about to regain, and that golden Greece and iron Babylonia were very real contemporary states,[23] which can be easily identified with the Byzantine Empire and Saracen countries.[24]

However, regardless of whether we agree that Leo of Vercelli was inspired by eschatological thinking or whether we reject such a view, we have to agree about one thing: the poet was convinced that Otto III's Empire was a world empire.

If we were to explain the meaning of the motto *Renovatio Imperii Romanorum*, taking as a point of reference the analysed work, we would need first of all to note that this renewal was ecclesiastical and religious. Its ultimate objective was purification and enlightenment of the world. On the other hand, it was inextricably connected with a restoration of Rome's power and revival of the Roman Empire. We could even say that a political renewal was a prerequisite for an ecclesiastical, spiritual and moral renewal, because the pope's and the emperor's religious works were possible only under the hegemony exercised by the Empire and spreading throughout the world.

Yet the Roman Empire had been established in Antiquity—Leo and his contemporaries were well aware of that. That is why whoever was thinking about a renewal of the *Imperium Romanum*, was thinking about a revival of the ancient world. This does not mean, however, that the future Bishop of Vercelli in any way contrasted the Empire—for example because it was originally a pagan institution—with the Church and the Christian religion.

The discussion about Otto III's eschatological thinking is part of a broader debate. According to a theory going back as far as Caesar Baronius but having its ardent supporters also among 19th century and contemporary medievalists, at the turn of the 2nd millennium in Europe there emerged an eschatological movement the followers of which expected a rapid end of time, a movement that had a profound impact on many areas of life at the time. However, the thesis in question was and still is firmly opposed. We could even say that in some French historiographical circles it is the done thing to regard the whole matter as an illusion and to severely reprimand any attempts to prove that around the year 1000 people believed that the end of the world was near. This is the message of S. Gougenheim's recently published book, *Les Fausses terreurs*. It is neither possible nor even necessary for me to express my opinion about this controversy in the present book. Suffice it to say that even if the criticism of Gougenheim and other historians is exaggerated and even if in some places there was indeed anxiety caused by eschatological expectations, such phenomena occurred in France, especially in Aquitaine, perhaps also in England. On the other hand, it is highly unlikely that they occurred in the Empire.

23   This is how the matter was understood by Schramm, *Kaiser, Rom und Renovatio*, 123, fn. 6.

24   Dormeier, "Die Renovatio Imperii," 170.

On the contrary, in his view there was full harmony between the two realities, with Apostle Peter being the unifying force bringing them together. Let us not forget that the person who in Leo's opinion was renewing Rome was the pope, *Vicarius Petri*, as the author calls him in the last verse. In the first verse the poet states that the gates of the City were opened before Gregory and Otto by the Prince of the Apostles, and in the third he mentions that through his actions the pope brings glory to the saint. In other words, the source of Rome's renewal lay in the will of Peter, the true lord of the Imperial capital, with the bishop-vicar working here on earth being the person implementing this will.

Versus de Gregorio et Ottone Augusto has survived in one manuscript only (Bamberg, Staatsbibliothek, Can. 1). The manuscript is an autograph—it has recently become possible to confirm this beyond any doubts. It has also been pointed out that the pages preceding *Versus de Gregorio* contain works by Eugenius Vulgarius. Therefore, it would be difficult to believe that Leo of Vercelli, a man who read widely, did not know that author's writings.

Eugenius Vulgarius is known for his love for the ancient world.[25] In his works he tried to zealously emulate ancient poets. Suffice it to say that when he wrote about contemporary Christian rulers, he used such expressions and words as if the monarchs were pagan. He did so even when he was addressing the Bishop of Rome. He seemed not to have accepted the fact that the ancient world had been gone for good.

For the poet that world was symbolized by the Roman Empire. He was convinced that it still existed and that it was still called to rule the entire earth. In a poem addressed to the Byzantine Emperor Leo VI he praised him for subjugating Europe, Asia and Africa with his armed forces, conquering all barbarian countries.[26] We could see in this an exaggeration characteristic of panegyrists, but there is no doubt that Eugenius Vulgarius considered an empire uniting all continents under its rule[27] to be an ideal. The poet must have realized that in his day the Empire did not exist in reality in such a form, but he was convinced, however, that the ideal could be and should be sought.[28]

---

25   Schramm, *Kaiser, Rom und Renovatio*, 50–54; Dormeier, "Die Renovatio Imperii," 172–174.

26   *Eugenii Vulgarii Sylloga*, ed. Paul von Winterfeld, MGH Poetae Latini, vol. 4, 1, no. 18, verse 3, 424–425.

27   Ibid., no. 16, 423: "Liquet orbem tripertitum unius imperii dominio unitum esse [. . .]" ("For clearly, the tripartite world is united under lordship of one empire").

28   For more on Eugenius Vulgarius' works addressed to Leo VI and on their political context see also Ulrich Ernst, Poesie und Geometrie. Betrachtungen zu einem visuellen Pyramidengedicht des Eugenius Vulgarius, in *Geistliche Denkformen in der Literatur des Mittelalters*, ed. Klaus Grubmüller, Ruth Schmidt-Wiegand, and Klaus Speckenbach, Münstersche Mittelalter-Schriften,51 (München: W. Fink, 1984), 321–335.

The same issue is touched upon in a poem addressed to Pope Sergius III. At the beginning the author writes about Rome and about the position the City occupies among peoples and nations. It is the capital of the world (*caput mundi*), which is manifested in a variety of ways: Rome has the highest authority on earth, imposes its will on all countries with war and terror, it is venerated by foreign kingdoms, and, finally, is the only immortal decoration of the world.[29] The description does not entirely apply to the actual state of affairs. What the poet means instead is the city's proud past, which, however, is slowly becoming reality again. This is what he writes in the following fragment:

> Sergius, ecce polos magnus qui vertice pulsat,
> Dignus apostolicus divino munere lectus,
> Mistice qui factus conformis imagine divûm,
> Aurea priscorum reparat nunc secla virorum.
> Scipiades claros, Fabios gentemque togatam,
> Fasces et curules, anulos ac paludamenta,
> Palmatas tunicas, trabeam falerasque nitentes,
> Imperium renovat heroum numenque priorum.
> Quocirca 'tantus vivat per secula praesul
> Pontificum primas, antistes summus et unus'
> Assiduis precibus dominus poscatur ab alto.[30]

The idea of renewal is expressed here clearly and unequivocally: the Golden Age, says the author, has come back, and the empire is beginning to shine with its former glory. Old senatorial families, the Scipiones and the Fabii, are returning, the *gens togata* is regaining its significance, curule seats and other insignia, which adorned Rome in its heyday, are back in use.

---

29   "Roma caput mundi, rerum suprema potestas, / Terrarum terror, fulmen, quod fulminat orbem, / Regnorum cultus, bellorum vivida virtus, / Immortale decus solum, haec urbs super omnes"—*Eugenii Vulgarii Sylloga*, no. 48, 440 ("Rome: centre of the world, supreme power over worldly affairs, terror of the lands, the thunderbolt that strikes the world, venerated by all kingdoms, full of valour in war—this city is the sole immortal ornament above all others").

30   Ibidem ("Behold, Sergius the Great who strikes against the summit of the heavens, the noble apopstolic Sergius, chosen by divine gift, who, mystically made in the image of the Gods, now renews the golden age of men of yore. The noble Scipiones, the Fabii begowned in the toga, the fasces and curule seats, the rings and cloaks, the embroidered tunics, purple togas and shining breastplates—Sergius restores all these, the empire of heroes itself, and the might of the ancients. And so 'let him, such a leader, first among bishops, live through the ages the highest and only high-priest'. With these constant prayers from the depths we beseech the lord").

What strikes us here is the multitude of terms and expressions bringing to mind the republican and imperial past of the City, and having nothing in common with its significance in the ecclesiastical order. There is no doubt that Eugenius Vulgarius writes about the *Imperium Romanum* flourishing again and not about a renewal of the Roman Church. On the other hand, the man who is to carry out this renewal or is already carrying it out is not the emperor but the pope. The poet explains why Sergius is able to do it: he is the highest bishop and as such constantly beseeches God. In other words, the sacerdotal dignity interpreted in Christian terms gives the pope the power to raise Rome to new heights. This is not a complete explanation, however. The author seems to be laying greater emphasis on the fact that St. Peter's successor (*apostolicus*) has been placed in his office by God himself, that thanks to the work of heaven (*mystice*) he becomes divinity-like and—with this power—restores the old days. At this point Eugenius speaks entirely in the spirit of the early medieval ideology of royal power, deeply rooted in Christianity.[31] A king or an emperor was said to be an image of God or Christ; people maintained that this quality was a source of charisma enjoyed by the monarch.[32] In other words, Eugenius Vulgarius sees the pope not only as a bishop and priest, but also as a monarch.

The source of Sergius's both dignities—that of a priest and that of a ruler— is the Petrine nature of the Roman See. For the poet, St. Peter was the cause of the City's rebirth, which did not have to be exclusively or even mainly an ecclesiastical rebirth. It was to consist in a restoration of the old Empire in the form in which it had existed in Antiquity.

In the context of our reflections, Eugenius Vulgarius' poetry is, as we can see, highly instructive. Not only does it provide evidence of fascination with Antiquity, fascination of authors writing in the 10th century, not only does it reflect the ideology and sensibility of the poet whose writings Leo of Vercelli knew, but also—and above all—it allows us to understand the following: people did not sense the slightest opposition between the Roman Empire, which, after all, had pagan roots, and Christianity. Their belief was even that the Roman Empire could be rebuilt, with all its splendour and glory, by the pope and that the pope could do it thanks to the fact that he was a successor of St. Peter. As we can see, Leo of Vercelli's idea expressed in *Versus de Gregorio et Ottone Augusto* had its antecedents and analogies. Naturally, each of the poets mentioned above stressed different things. For Eugenius Vulgarius, of key importance was a rebuilding of the ancient world, which could happen only thanks to the pope's ministry. On the other hand, what mattered to Leo first of

---

31   Schramm, *Kaiser, Rom und Renovatio*, 54.

32   Michałowski, "Otto III w obliczu ideowego wyzwania," passim.

all was a religious rebirth. However, it was obvious to him that a prerequisite for this was a restoration of political glory to Rome.

Let me sum up my reflections so far. The idea behind the motto *Renovatio Imperii Romanorum* was multi-faceted. It contained a feeling of nostalgia for past political glory, admiration for old secular institutions, profound veneration for the ancient civilization, hope for a future world superpower and will to carry out a great religious work. All this was combined with a cult of Rome as the centre of the Empire, and with a conviction that the Lord of the City and, consequently, the Lord of the Empire, was St. Peter.

Let us try to analyse the various threads referring to a broader base of sources.

Plenty of ancient reminiscences and references to the Roman Empire can be found in a dedication letter addressed to Otto III, which opens Gerbert of Aurillac's work entitled *De rationali et ratione uti*.[33] The author refers to an event which happened a few months earlier. He recalls that during discussions at the imperial court (most likely in Magdeburg) no one was able to present a philosophical question that interested the monarch. The ruler decided that such ignorance was unworthy of the "sacred palace" (*sacrum palatium*) and ordered that a treatise be written on the topic in question. And now he, Gerbert, is fulfilling that task. The author expresses his joy at the fact that, as the book has been written, Italy will not have reasons to believe that the "sacred palace" has sunk into a state of apathy, and Greece will not be able to boast that it is the only country tackling imperial philosophy and the only one with the Roman power at its disposal. Gerbert ends his argument with the following words:

> Nostrum, nostrum est Romanum imperium; dant vires ferax frugum Italia, ferax militum Gallia et Germania, nec Scythae nobis desunt fortissima regna. Noster es, Caesar, Romanorum imperator et Auguste, qui summo Graecorum sanguine ortus, Graecos imperio superas, Romanis hereditario jure imperas, utrosque ingenio et eloquentia praevenis.[34]

---

33   *Oeuvres de Gerbert*, ed. Alexandre Olleris (Paris: F. Thibaud, 1867), text of the letter on 297–299. See Percy Ernst Schramm, "Kaiser, Basileus und Papst in der Zeit der Ottonen," *Historische Zeitschrift* 129 (1924): 462–463; Carla Frova, "Gerberto philosophus, il 'De rationali et ratione uti'," in *Gerberto: scienza, storia e mito*, 351–377; Dominique Poirel, "Le De rationali et ratione uti de Gerbert," in *Autour de Gerbert d'Aurillac*, 313–320.

34   *Oeuvres de Gerbert*, 298 ("It is ours, ours, the Roman Empire; Italy, abounding in harvests, and Gaul and Germany, rich in soldiers, give us might, lest the most powerful kingdoms of Scythia be lost to us. It is ours, Caesar, emperor of the Romans and Augustus, you who, born of the best Greek stock, overcome the Greeks by your command, command the Romans by hereditary right, and surpass both in talent and eloquence").

The dedication letter, commented in the literature on the subject on many occasions, testifies to Gerbert's deep love for the Roman Empire. Yet, at the same time, the text quoted above reflects a conviction that the *Imperium Romanum* still exists and that its centre is in "our" hands, that is, in the hands of people including the author of the letter and its addressee. What makes the French-Aquitainian intellectual so optimistic? First, he invokes a geopolitical argument: a greater number of countries, namely Italy, Gaul and Scythia, are within one state, which is a situation creating stronger—both military and economic—foundations of power. The second argument refers to the person of Otto III. He, too, is "ours". It is a well-known fact that the monarch comes from the finest Hellenic family and surpasses the Greeks with the power that he wields. In addition, it is known that he rules the Romans thanks to the law of inheritance. Moreover, he surpasses both nations with his mind and eloquence. It seems that Gerbert's reasoning is to lead to the following conclusion: "our" Empire is universal, because—vast and powerful in itself—thanks to Otto, who is "ours", it rules Rome and extends its hegemony to Greece.

An important element in the reasoning is the book written by Gerbert, who now offers it to the young ruler. The author is convinced that the Roman Empire and its power are where learning flourishes. That is why he believes that the treatise *De rationali et ratione uti* will encourage both the Greeks and the Romans to acknowledge that the Empire is in Otto III's hands. *Translatio studii* as *Translatio Imperii*—this is a theory some traces of which can be seen here.[35] However, historians of science point out that the work in question is full of erudition and dialectical display, exaggerated given the issues raised in it. The reason seems to be clear: Gerbert wanted to show that Otto III's palace was a centre of true love of wisdom and this is why it was a "sacred", that is, an imperial palace.[36] The kind of philosophy practised in the book was important, too. By tackling issues that were vigorously discussed, especially in the past, by Greek thinkers, Gerbert makes the German court part of the tradition of the ancient and Byzantine empire. In terms of intellectual culture, Otto III is the equal of emperors once ruling the city on the Tiber and now the city on the Bosphorus; moreover, it could be said that he even surpasses them. The treatise now being submitted testifies to that.[37]

---

35   Poirel, "Le De rationali," 319.

36   Ibid.

37   Frova, "Gerberto," 374–375. This scholar believes that some role in the ideology formulated by the Frenchman was played by a comparison between two couples: Gerbert (master)-Otto III (pupil) and Aristotle-Alexander the Great. Since it was Otto III who wanted to have Gerbert for his master, it is highly likely that the youthful monarch consciously took part in this game.

The dedication letter attached to the treatise *De rationali et ratione uti* is instructive in our context for several reasons. As the commented source suggests, the idea of the Roman Empire's hegemony over the entire Christian world was known in Otto III's milieu. Moreover, it was so vivid that some were inclined to regard the Empire understood in this way as a political reality happening among them. Noteworthy are the purely secular connotations of the notion of *Imperium Romanum*. Even philosophy, the practice of which is part of the essence of the Empire, is a secular discipline here. In his work Gerbert tackles no issue that would be directly connected to religion. The subject of the treatise is logic, with the author showing off his familiarity with pagan authors and not the Church Fathers.

Gerbert's work was written between late 997 and the spring of the following year, at a time when the monarch was heading for Rome to put down the rebellion started by Crescentius and Johannes Philagathos. As we can see, the months preceding the adoption of the *Renovatio Imperii Romanorum* motto were marked by a discussion, taking place at Otto III's court, about what the Roman Empire was. Another question asked was in whose hands the Empire found itself and how realistic its renewal was.

A year and a half later, that is, on 7 May 999 the ruler granted a great privilege to the Bishopric of Vercelli. For some time its bishop had been Leo, a figure already familiar to us. The monarch's generosity was indeed extraordinary. He gave the bishopric not only the city of Vercelli, but also two entire counties (Vercelli and Santhià) with all prerogatives of the count. The disposition ends with a kind of preamble, reading as follows:

> [...] ut libere et securę permanente Dei ecclesia prosperetur nostrum imperium, triumphet corona nostrę militię, propagetur potentia populi Romani et restituatur res publica, ut in huius mundi hospitio honeste vivere, de huius vitę carcere honestius avolare et cum domino honestissime mereamur regnare.[38]

We are dealing with a formula characteristic of medieval diplomas, according to which the ruler's donation to the Church contributes to the ruler's earthly and eternal prosperity, builds the power of his state and multiplies the happiness of

---

38   DO III, no. 324, 752–753 ("[...] that our rule should be made to prosper freely and securely by the enduring church of God, the crown of our army should triumph, that the power of the Roman people should increase and the state should be rebuilt, in order that we might truly deserve to live honourably as guests in this world, that we might more honourably fly away from the prison of this life and most honourably rule with the Lord").

people living in his kingdom.[39] It is, so to speak, a classic formula that is not the focus of our attention. What matters is something else. The expressions used in the text bring to mind the ancient world and the ancient Imperium Romanum. They speak of the power of the Roman nation and renewal of the state. It is worth noting that Leo of Vercelli is commonly regarded as the person who dictated the document. The same author wrote another diploma, this time for the monastery in Farfa. The narrative mentions the fact that a place not far from the abbey in question was the venue of a meeting between the emperor and Margrave Hugh *pro restituenda re publica* and that together with Pope Sylvester and other dignitaries they debated imperial affairs.[40]

Similar tones can be found in the *Life of St. Bernward*, in a fragment dealing with events from early 1001. Otto III, who has hidden in a tower during a rebellion of the people of Rome, speaks to them in the following manner:

> Vosne estis mei Romani? Propter vos quidem meam patriam propinquos quoque reliqui. Amore vestro meos Saxones et cunctos Theotiscos, sanguinem meum, proieci; vos in remotas partes nostri imperii adduxi, quo patres vestri, cum Orbem ditione premerent, numquam pedem posuerunt; scilicet ut nomen vestrum et gloriam ad fines usque dilatarem; vos filios adoptavi, vos cunctis praetuli. Causa vestra, dum vos omnibus proposui, universorum in me invidiam et odium commovi.[41]

---

39   Michałowski, *Princeps fundator*, 29–36 and passim.

40   DO III, no. 331 of 3 October 999, 759: "[…] nos quodam die Roma exeuntes, pro restituenda republica cum marchione nostro Hugone convenimus et consilia imperii nostri cum venerabili papa Siluestro secundo et cum aliis nostris optimatibus tractavimus" ("[…] leaving Rome one day we met with our marquis Hugo in order to restore the state, and discussed plans with the venerable Pope Silvester II and other leading men of state").

41   *Vita Bernwardi episcopi Hildesheimensis auctore Thangmaro, MGH SS*, vol. 4, ed. Georg Heinrich Pertz (Hanover: Hahn, 1841), cap. 25, 770 ("Are you not my Romans? For you indeed I left my people and my homeland. For love of you I rejected my Saxons and all Teutons, my blood; I led you to the farthest parts of our empire, where your fathers, when they held in their grasp the rule over the world, never placed their tread. I adopted you as my sons; I preferred you over all others. Because of you, when I set you before all, I stirred the hate and envy of the world against me"). Recently, there has been some controversy concerning the time of writing and the authorship of the work. The question is whether the *vita* was written in the 12th century or whether its main part was written shortly after Bernward's death (d. 1022) by Thangmar, with only some hagiographic phraseology and several chapters being added in the following century. I am inclined to agree with the second view; in any case I regard the commented fragment as Ottonian. Cf. Knut Görich and Hans-Henning Kortüm, "Otto III., Thangmar und die Vita Bernwardi," *Mitteilungen des Instituts des Österreichische Geschichte* 98 (1990): 1–57; Hartmut Hoffmann, *Mönchskönig*

Again we have a reference to the *Imperium Romanum*—to the Ancient Empire and to the Empire existing contemporaneously. Otto III, undoubtedly alluding to the Gniezno pilgrimage, proudly notes that he has made Rome's name famous across the world, and has led the Romans to places which their ancestors did not reach when they ruled the whole world.

In order to get a more complete view on the issue in question, let us recall that according to Thietmar, Otto III tried to revive the ancient customs of the Romans. In this context the chronicler mentions the way in which the monarch used to have his meals: the emperor would sit alone at a semicircular table placed higher than the table or tables of the others partaking of the meal. We are given to understand that this type of behaviour was criticized by many.[42] Another fact, often cited in this context, needs to be referred to as well: during their visits to the Eternal City, the Carolingians and the Liudolfingians would reside outside its walls, in a palace built near St. Peter's Basilica. Otto III, on the other hand, stayed in the heart of Rome, on the Palatine Hill. This was where ancient emperors had had their seat.[43]

While the dedication letter to the treatise *De rationali et ratione uti* sheds light on the views of people in Otto III's milieu, four other sources reflect the attitude of the emperor himself. In the light of this evidence, there is no doubt that the monarch was an ardent believer in the idea of *Renovatio* and made efforts to implement it. He did so on several levels. He made a donation to the Bishopric of Vercelli for the purposes of renewal; he debated the restoration of the Empire's glory with the elites of the state and the Church; he made court ceremonies conform to his ideas of ancient ceremonies; and he established his residence on the Palatine Hill. Such actions were something more than just a preparation for a revival of the Empire in the future; some of them restored the glory of the Empire there and then.

The Gniezno Summit was among the events which were bringing about a renewal of the Roman Empire.[44] Let us consider the following information.

---

und rex idiota. *Studien zur Kirchenpolitik Heinrichs II. und Konrads II.*, MGH Studien und Texte 8 (Hanover: Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 1993), 114; Marcus Stumpf, "Zum Quellenwert von Thangmars Vita Bernwardi," *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters* 53 (1997): 461–496. Cf. also Görich, "Otto III," 99–113.

42   Thietmar, lib. IV, cap. 47, 184. For more on this, see Schramm, *Kaiser, Rom und Renovatio*, 110–112; see also my remarks, Roman Michałowski, "Die Politik von Otto III. in neuer Beleuchtung," *Acta Poloniae Historica* 75 (1997): 173.

43   Carlrichard Brühl, "Die Kaiserpfalz bei St. Peter und die Pfalz Ottos III. auf dem Palatin," 1st ed. 1954, in idem, *Aus Mittelalter und Diplomatik*, vol. 1, Hildesheim (Munich and Zurich: Weidmann, 1989), 3–31.

44   See Dormeier, "Die Renovatio Imperii," 184–185.

Before his journey to Poland (October 999), Otto III held council *pro restituenda re publica*; legal acts that were important for the Empire took place at the tomb of St. Adalbert, with the monarch himself being convinced that Poland was incorporated into the Empire at the time—this is how we should interpret the ruler's words addressed to the rebellious Romans. Indeed, regardless of how we understood the titles granted to Bolesław Chrobry, it would be difficult to question the fact that they specified the Polish prince's obligations to the Empire. Perhaps this is the context in which we should interpret the motto *Roma Aurea* adorning the lead seals of the second type. By giving up the *Renovatio Imperii Romanorum* motto, the ruler seemed to be thinking that following, for example, the events in Gniezno, the renewal had already happened and that the inscription *Roma Aurea* better reflected the new situation.[45]

In addition, we cannot fail to note that the *Renovatio* pursued by the ruler seemed—at least at first sight—to be a secular renewal. It was to be expressed in the greatness of the Empire as well as the power and fame of the Roman nation. Regardless of the exact content of these terms, one thing is beyond doubt—these were not ecclesiastical terms.

The idea of restoring the Empire played some role throughout the 10th century; it was also present in the political thought of the Liudolfingians, at least from the moment they took the imperial crown. Yet we have the right to claim that Otto III experienced this ideology more profoundly than his father and grandfather. For the brief independent reign of the last of the Ottonians we have more facts in which the idea of renewal of the Empire was expressed than for the reigns of his two predecessors. I have cited some, although not all, of them in this book. What is more, with their explicitness some of them surpass anything that could be related to the earlier Liudolfingians. It is enough to mention the changes introduced by Otto III into the court etiquette, or the motto *Renovatio Imperii Romanorum*.

The political thought of this last ruler had another unique feature as well. It was deeply imbued with all kinds of references to the Christian *sacrum*. Of course, I realize that throughout the early Middle Ages Christian monarchy was closely associated with religion; we could say that it was wholly immersed

---

45 The new *bulla* is interpreted in a similar manner by Görich, "Otto III," 199–202. However, this scholar believes that Otto III intended the restitution of the empire to come down to settling all matters associated with the papacy. We should also bear in mind the opinion of P. E. Schramm, who believed that the *Aurea Roma* motto was placed on the second type of the *bulla* only because the inscription *Renovatio Imperii Romanorum* was too long for such a small seal, but that the meaning of the inscriptions was identical (Schramm, "Drei Nachträge zu den Metallbullen," 14).

in it.[46] Nevertheless, Otto III's political thought still makes an extraordinary impression from this point of view. It is not difficult to see this: suffice it to examine some of the titles used by the emperor.[47]

A document dated 17 January 1000 contains the following titles: "Otto tercius servus Iesu Christi et Romanorum inperator secundum voluntatem dei salvatoris nostrique liberatoris".[48] The monarch used identical or similar titles during his entire expedition to Gniezno. A more detailed analysis of the terms used in the titles is carried out in the subchapter devoted to his pilgrimage to St. Adalbert's tomb (see Chapter II). However, at this point I should once again point to the unequivocally religious nature of the title *servus Iesu Christi*—a title not borne by any other monarch in Latin Europe, regardless of whether he was a prince, a king or an emperor.

After Otto's return from his pilgrimage to Gniezno, the formula *servus Iesu Christi* was no longer used in the documents, but there appeared new extraordinary titles and expressions. Let us compare several more interesting examples of these:

1. "Otto tercius secundum voluntatem Iesu Christi Romanorum imperator augustus sanctarumque ecclesiarum devotissimus et fidelissimus dilatator".[49]

2. "Otto servus apostolorum et secundum voluntatem Dei salvatoris Romanorum imperator augustus".[50]

---

46   I have succinctly presented my point of view in: Michałowski, "Podstawy religijne monarchii".

47   For more on Otto III's titles, see e.g. Schramm, *Kaiser, Rom und Renovatio*, 141–146, 157–160; Wenskus, *Studien*, 143; Wolfram, "Lateinische Herrschertitel," 153–162; Harald Zimmermann, "Gerbert als kaiserlicher Rat", in *Gerberto: scienza, storia e mito*, 249–250; Althoff, *Otto III.*, 136, 171–172. Bernhardt, "Der Herrscher," 332–334; Hubertus Seibert, "Herrscher und Mönchtum im spätottonischen Reich," in *Otto III.—Heinrich II. eine Wende?*, 249–250; Germana Gandino, "Ruolo dei linguaggi e linguaggio di ruoli. Ottone III, Silvestro II e un episodio delle relazioni tra imperio e papato," *Quaderni Storici*, nuova serie 102 (1999): 617–658; Fried, *Święty Wojciech*, 22–32; Jasiński, "Tytulatura Bolesława Chrobrego," passim; Huschner, "Abt Odilo von Cluny," 151–152.

48   DO III, no. 334, 774.

49   DO III, no. 388, 818, from 18 January 1001 ("Otto the Third, by the will of Jesus Christ Emperor Augustus of the Romans and most devout and faithful expander of the holy churches").

50   DO III, no. 389, 820 (not dated); document quoted after Schramm, *Kaiser, Rom und Renovatio*, vol. 2: *Exkurse und Texte*, Studien der Bibliothek Warburg 17/$_2$ (Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner, 1929), 66–67, titles on 65 ("Otto, servant of the apostles, and by the will of God the Saviour, Emperor of the Romans").

3. "Otto tercius Romanus Saxonicus et Italicus, apostolorum servus, dono dei Romani orbis imperator augustus".[51]
4. "Otto servus apostolorum".[52]

There are several facts worthy of note in the examples quoted above. Firstly, most cases contain the expression *servus apostolorum* which denotes the emperor and which was never used as a royal title anywhere else. Secondly, it appears, for example, in the diploma of 23 January 1001 dictated personally by Otto III,[53] which removes any suspicion that the formula in question might have been introduced by the chancellery without the issuer's knowledge. Thirdly, in a diploma dated 25 July 1001 the term *servus apostolorum* appears as the only title. This means that the whole essence of the matter was contained in it. The person issuing the document must have assumed that since the intitulation already contained the analyzed expression, the term *Romanorum imperator* could be dropped without much damage.

Religious and ecclesiastical connotations of the title in question are beyond any doubt. The same can be said with regard to a term appearing in the first example, where the emperor is referred to as the one who propagates Churches. We are probably dealing here with an allusion to the role the monarch played in the establishment of the Polish and Hungarian church provinces. However, how should the expression *servus apostolorum* be explained?

The monarch used this title in many (though not all) documents from January 1001 until his death.[54] The first diploma containing the intitulation in question is probably one granting a privilege to the Roman Church—the document is not dated but was probably issued in early 1001.[55] This source requires a slightly longer analysis.

---

51   DO III, no. 390, 821, from 23 January 1001 ("Otto the third, Roman, Saxon, and Italian, servant of the apostles, and by the gift of God Emperor of the Roman world").

52   DO III, no. 407, 841, from 25 July 1001, ("Otto, servant of the apostles").

53   Hartmut Hofmann, "Eigendiktat in den Urkunden Ottos III. und Heinrichs II.," *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters* 44 (1988): 390–423, especially 392–399.

54   The last known document with this title is DO III, no. 423, 856–857 dated 11 January 1002.

55   Here are several important works dealing with the privilege: Schramm, *Kaiser, Rom und Renovatio*, vol. 1, 161–176; Horst Fuhrmann, "Konstantinische Schenkung und abendländisches Kaisertum. Ein Beitrag zur Überlieferungsgeschichte des Constitutum Constantini," *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters* 22 (1966): 128–137; Kurt Zeillinger, "Otto III. und die Konstantinische Schenkung. Ein Beitrag zur Interpretation des Diploms Kaiser Ottos III. für Papst Silvester II. (DO III 389)," in *Fälschungen im Mittelalter*, vol. 2, MGH Schriften, 33/$_2$ (Hanover: Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 1988), 506–536; Hartmut Hoffmann, "Ottonische Fragen," *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des*

What is extraordinary in it is not only the intitulation, but, even more so, the preamble and narrative. The monarch begins with a confession of faith. He states that he regards Rome as the capital of the world, and the Roman Church—as the mother of all Churches.[56] This creed gives the emperor a moral and legal basis for an extraordinarily strong attack on the papacy. Otto III accuses Bishops of Rome of having squandered all the wealth of their Church. Not only have they sold what belonged to St. Peter outside the City walls, but they have also squandered the Apostles' property within the City. They have even stripped the altars belonging to them. The monarch does not stop at this accusation and adds another one, almost as serious. The popes, no longer caring for what they have lost, have appropriated the property of the emperor and the empire in order to subordinate a large part of the Empire to their office.

Here we come across a fragment that is not very clear[57] and for this reason there have been a variety of interpretations by scholars as well as a variety of translations into modern languages. One thing is beyond doubt: Otto III refers here to the Donation of Constantine. It seems that the most convincing interpretation—convincing for being logically consistent with the message of the rest of the document—is the classic interpretation once proposed by Percy Ernst Schramm and recently defended by Hartmut Hoffmann: the emperor rejects the view whereby Constantine the Great gave Rome and part of the Empire to the Holy See, and, at the same time, accuses the papacy of having made the forgery containing this lie.

Mittelalters 51 (1995): 71–76; Hans-Henning Kortüm, "Gerbertus qui et Silvester. Papsttum um die Jahrtausendwende," *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters* 55 (1999): 29–62, especially 52–62; Gandino, "Ruolo dei linguaggi," passim; Jerzy Strzelczyk, "Gerbert z Aurillac -Sylwester II. Papież roku tysięcznego," *Życie i Myśl* 46 (1999), no. 4 (444): 48–50; idem, *Otton III*, 171–177; Giancarlo Andenna, "Silvestro, Roma e le Gallie," in *Gerberto d'Aurillac da Abate di Bobbio a Papa*, 521–522.

56   "Romam caput mundi profitemur, Romanam ecclesiam matrem omnium ecclesiarum esse testamur […]"—Schramm, *Kaiser, Rom und Renovatio*, vol. 2, 66 ("We acknowledge that Rome is the capital of the world, and we testify that the Roman church is the mother of all churches" […]).

57   "Hec sunt enim commenta, ab illis ipsis [i.e. by the popes] inventa, quibus Johannes diaconus, cognomento Digitorum Mutilus preceptum aureis litteris scripsit, sub titulo magni Constantini longa mendacii tempora finxit"—ibidem ("For these are the fictions, invented by the popes themselves, for the benefit of whom the deacon John, known as Digitorum Mutilus, wrote the decree in golden letters, and under the name of Constantine the Great, contrived a long-enduring lie").

Shortly after that the issuer of the document disposes of a privilege associated in the literature on the subject with Charles the Bald. The monarch is of the opinion that none of Charles's donations to the Holy See have ever been legally valid, because the donor wanted to give what was not his to give.

Overruling thus all possible legal objections,[58] Otto III announces his will: from what belongs to him, and not to St. Peter, he gives to the Prince of the Apostles eight counties listed by name. The details of this disposition are of no great importance to us and I will not comment on them. What is interesting, on the other hand, is the fact that the issuer also writes about another act of his attachment to the Prince of the Apostles. Guided by his love for him, he chose his master Sylvester to be pope and elevated him to this office.[59]

The document in question provides us with insight into how Otto III understood his role in Rome. Firstly, he believed that he was at home there. *Nostra urbs regia*—this is how he refers to the Eternal City in the diploma. In order to give his position a stronger legal basis, he decided to reject the Donation of Constantine. This could have had implications for international policy. Paradoxically, the *Constitutum Constantini* was invoked by the Byzantines to demonstrate that the true Empire was theirs and that its capital city was Constantinople.[60] However, there is no doubt that something else was more important for Otto III: namely, to be able to freely decide the Roman affairs and regard Rome as his capital. This was the prime objective of the questioning of Charles the Bald's donation.

Secondly, the monarch presents himself as the one who truly loves St. Peter—he gives over to him control over vast territories on earth and he appoints the pope. What is more, he—the emperor—is a true servant of the Prince of the Apostles. The popes not only have been unable to prevent his property from being stolen, but they have also contributed to the squandering of this property. The emperor, on the other hand, multiplies the earthly possessions of the Prince of the Apostles.

---

58 The text can also be interpreted as meaning that by rejecting *en bloc* all forgeries made in Rome, Otto also rejected the otherwise authentic Ottonianum (see Gandino, *Ruolo dei linguaggi*, 634, 637).

59 "[…] pro amore sancti Petri domnum Siluestrum magistrum nostrum papam elegimus et Deo volente ipsum serenissimum ordinavimus et creavimus […]—ibid., 67, ("For the love of Saint Peter we have elected our master lord Silvester pope, and God-willing, have ordained and made him the most serene").

60 Fauvarque, "Sylvestre II et Otto III," 55; cf. however Gilbert Dagron, *Empereur et prêtre. Etude sur le "césaropapisme" byzantin* ([Paris]: Gallimard, 1995), 250–251.

As we read the document, we can see that the title *servus apostolorum* found in it was not an empty formula, used for some unknown reason. On the contrary, it reflected the emperor's profound conviction that he was responsible for the prosperity of the Holy See and for the devotion due to the Apostles. This was associated with the opinion, very clearly stated in the privilege, that the Bishop of Rome, if left to his own devices, would not be able to properly care for the condition of the papal Church. There is another striking fact: the monarch clearly and unequivocally says that he appointed the current pope, adding that his action was in accordance with God's will. He must have been in no doubt that he had the right to act in this way. It is easy to understand from where this certainty came. Since ultimately the good of the Holy See is the responsibility of the emperor—after all, no one, especially not the pope, can substitute for him in this—the emperor should decide who occupies the see in question.

There is no doubt that both in Otto III's milieu and in the Roman Curia, even after the death of the emperor, his right to name the pope was commonly accepted. This is confirmed by official texts, namely two papal epitaphs—one from St. Peter's Basilica in the Vatican and the other in the Basilica of St. John Lateran. Gregory V's tombstone, placed perhaps by Otto III or perhaps by Sylvester II, bears an inscription which openly says that the pope was put in charge of Peter's flock by the said monarch.[61] The inscription is a eulogy—which stems in any case from its very nature—and in addition to biographical data it lists the deceased's virtues. But by doing so, it sheds a positive light on the emperor and his deed, that is, the fact that he appointed perhaps not a great but a worthy man to the Holy See.

The other tombstone was founded by Sylvester's second successor, Sergius IV (1009–1012).[62] The author of this last inscription, too, did not hesitate to write that Pope Sylvester owed his dignity to Otto III.[63] In this case the emperor's

---

61   *MGH* Poetae Latini, vol. 5, 1, 337. See Karwasińska, "Studia krytyczne nad żywotami św. Wojciecha, biskupa praskiego. III," 21.

62   Most recent editions and comments: Robert Favreau, "L'Epitaphe de Silvestre II à Saint-Jean-de-Latran," in *Autour de Gerbert d'Aurillac*, 337–341 (edition 337, translation into French 337–338.); Giuseppe De Spirito, "Silvestro II ed il Laterano o dell'epitafio di Gerberto d'Aurillac in relazione ad altri iscrizioni lateranensi," in *Gerberto d'Aurillac da Abate di Bobbio a Papa*, 727–777 (edition 740–741, translation into Italian 742–744). For more on Sergius IV's spirituality, see Hans Martin Schaller, "Zur Kreuzugsenzyklika Papst Sergius' IV." in *Papsttum, Kirche und Recht im Mittelalter. Festschrift für Horst Fuhrmann zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. Hubert Mordek (Tübingen: M. Niemeyer, 1991), 135–153.

63   Let me quote the most important fragment of the source:
      "Post annum Romam, mutato nomine sumpsit [sc. Silvester]
      ut toto pastor fieret orbe novus,

merit seems all the greater given the fact that the tone of description of the deceased is much more lofty than in the previous inscription. While in Gregory v's epitaph the emphasis is on the virtues of private piety, the author of the second inscription writes about the universal role played by Sylvester. He notes that his pontificate brought blessing to the whole world. When Sylvester died, peace vanished and the triumphs enjoyed by the Church in those days became a thing of the past.

The inscription from the tombstone of the Bishop of Rome also eulogizes Otto III as the one who elevated Sylvester to Peter's See. It is an eulogy to Otto for another reason as well. The author claims that the world experienced happiness not only thanks to the pope but also thanks to the emperor. They both enlightened the period with the virtue of wisdom (what a striking similarity to Leo of Vercelli's poem!), it was during their reigns that the entire earth experienced joyful days and it was during their reigns that all evil was vanquished. This is much more than just an approval of the imperial prerogatives concerning the appointment of the Bishop of Rome. As we can see, the person commissioning the inscription subscribed to the political theory according to which the ideal state for the world and the Church was a close collaboration of both universal powers: the empire and the papacy.[64] Sergius IV was a Roman and during his pontificate Germany's political pressure on the affairs of the Eternal City was slight. Thus it turns out that even from a

---

cui nimium placuit sociali mente fidelis mente fidelis

obtulit hoc Cesar tertius Otto sibi.

Tempus uterque comit clara virtute sophiae

gaudet et omne seculum, frangitur omne reum.

Clavigeri instar erat caelorum sede potitus

Terna suffectus cui vice pastor erat.

Iste vicem Petri postquam suscepit abegit

lustralis spatio secula morte sui.

Obriguit mundus, discussa pace, triumphus

Aecclesiae nutans dedicit requiem" (Favreau, "L'Epitaphe," vv. 5–10, 337)—"After a year, having changed his name he took Rome, to become the new shepherd of the whole world. Otto III, the devout Caesar, offered him this as an ally, and was very pleased to do so. Each adorned the age with the brilliant power of their wisdom, the whole world rejoiced, all evil was shattered. Like the gate-keeper of the heavens he occupied the See. For the third time he was given the role of shepherd. After he received the seat of St Peter, he departed this world by his death. The world froze, peace was shattered, the triumph of the Church faltered and forgot peace."

64   See Favreau, "L'Epitaphe," 339; De Spirito, "Silvestro II," 759.

purely Roman perspective the strong position enjoyed by the emperor in Rome
was not questioned; on the contrary, it was regarded as a desired situation.

The same idea was expressed in the language of visual arts by the author of
the *situla* (stoup) currently kept in the Aachen cathedral.[65] Made largely of ivory,
it probably originated in Otto III's times, although the dating, as is often the
case with historic Ottonian paintings and sculptures, is debatable. Sometimes
it is assumed that from the very beginning it belonged to the palace chapel in
Aachen. The *situla* is in the form of a two-storey structure, with the lower storey
depicting a row of armed warriors and the upper storey—St. Peter surrounded
by several figures: the pope, the emperor, four archbishops and one abbot. I
will not delve into the rich and complex iconography of the stoup. Following
Piotr Skubiszewski, I will only say that this structure symbolizes the Church
and that the artist attributed a special—in a way the most important—role
in it to the Prince of the Apostles, who sits in the middle, between the pope
and the emperor. Worthy of note is not only the fact that the last two figures
are placed right next to St. Peter, but, above all, the fact that they are depicted
sitting, whereas all the other figures from the upper and lower storey are
standing. There is only one explanation of this: the artist wanted to express the
idea that the pope and the emperor had a share in the Petrine office, that they
helped the Prince of the Apostles to govern the Church here on earth. That one
of these figures is the Bishop of Rome can be regarded as an obvious matter
requiring no comment. What deserves to be stressed, on the other hand, is the
fact that a similar role was attributed to the monarch. Like the pope, he is a
servant of the Apostle. This is the truth that the imperial chancellery wanted
to express by giving its ruler the title of *servus apostolorum*.[66]

It is also worth referring to the evidence of the *Life of St. Adalbert I*. Its oldest
surviving version was commissioned by Otto III or at least was looked through
and supplemented at his court. Of interest to us is Chapter 21, which mentions
the young king's first expedition to Rome. The period was marked by events of
the highest importance: the German ruler attained the title of emperor and his
relative became the pope. In our context two facts included in the description
deserve to be mentioned. First, the hagiographer asks why the venue of the
imperial coronation is the Eternal City. He gives two answers complementing
each other: *Roma* is the capital of the world and mistress of all cities, and that
is why it gives the imperial diadem to kings; in her womb rests the body of

---

65   For more on this, see Piotr Skubiszewski, "Ecclesia, Christianitas, Regnum et Sacerdotium
        dans l'art des Xᵉ–XIᵉ s. Idées et structures des images," *Cahiers de Civilisation Médiévale* 28
        (1985): 136–152 (references there to the earlier vast literature on the subject).

66   Skubiszewski, "Ecclesia," 152.

the Prince of the saints, which is why she should appoint the "prince" of all lands.[67] At the end of the chapter—and this is the other significant detail—the author points to universal joy among the people of Rome caused by the fact that "nouus imperator dat iura populis, dat iura nouus papa".[68]

Thus we come across the same idea again: in the Eternal City power is exercised jointly by two people, the emperor and the pope, and this is apparently something everyone should wish for, since their joint rule fills the entire nation with hope.[69] In any case, can we really be surprised by the idea in question, given the fact that the author of the *Vita I* maintains that the source of the imperial and the papal dignity is the Prince of the Apostles? He draws a parallel between the emperor, called here *princeps terrarum*, and St. Peter, described as *princeps sanctorum*, suggesting that only the latter has the authority to appoint the emperor. This is the basis on which Rome—the city in which the body of the Prince of the Apostles is buried—builds its prerogatives. Although the hagiographer did not write that St. Peter was the source of papal power as well, this view was commonly known and accepted in the West.

There is another element in our *dossier*—the second type of Otto III's lead seal. I have said earlier that the emperor intended the *bulla* to be modelled on papal *bullae*. It must be noted that the emperor used that seal exactly at the same time as he used the title *servus apostolorum*. For the first time it was attached to the above mentioned document granting a privilege to the Roman Church and subsequently it was used to authenticate various documents until the monarch's death. It is easy to understand what motivated the emperor to acquire this kind of *bulla*. It was to express the truth that the ruler was holding an office which was analogous to the papal office and which complemented it.[70]

---

67   *Adalberti Vita I*, cap. 21, 32: "Roma autem cum caput mundi et urbium domina sit et uocetur, sola reges imperare facit; cumque principis sanctorum corpus suo sinu refoueat, merito principem terrarum ipsa constituere debet" ("For since Rome is, and is called, the capital of the world and the lord of cities, Rome alone grants kings their imperial rule; and since Rome shelters the body of the emperor of the saints in its bosom, it is fitting that Rome itself should install in office the emperor of the lands").

68   Ibid., 33 ("The new emperor and the new pope promulgate laws for the people").

69   The analyzed concept irritated later hagiographers. The author of version *B*, referred to by Jadwiga Karwasińska as *Redactio Aventinensis altera*, changed the relevant sentence ("cum novo imperatore dat populis nouus papa") to highlight the role of the pope at the expense of the emperor. This expression was also included in version *C*, *Redactio Cassinensis* (ibid., 62, 81). See Karwasińska, "Studia krytyczne nad żywotami św. Wojciecha, biskupa praskiego. III," 14, 20.

70   This is a thesis put forward recently by Keller, "Die Siegel und Bullen Ottos III.," 772.

This title, *servus apostolorum*, reflected the emperor's conviction that his main task was to care for the Roman Church and, consequently, universal Church, as well as all the matters that concerned it. The mission *ad gentes* must have been among them.[71] For several hundred years the Holy See had been taking care for this area of activity. However, the prerogatives which Otto III ascribed to himself as a servant of the Apostles were certainly much broader.

The imperial titles from the last two years of his reign testify to the fact that Otto's thinking in terms of political theology grew exceptionally intense at the time. It must be stressed that these were not reflections without any practical consequences. On the contrary, as a servant of Jesus Christ he brought about a breakthrough in the political and ecclesiastical situation at the north-eastern frontier of the Empire. As a servant of the Apostles he tried to strengthen control over the papacy. Let us note the following event. On 13 January 1001, that is, more or less at the time when the privilege for the Roman Church was being written, a synod was held in the Eternal City, featuring the pope and the emperor. Significantly, the sessions were held not in one of the great basilicas, such as St. Peter's in the Vatican, but on the Palatine Hill, where Otto III had his palace, specifically at Santa Maria in Pallaria, a church also known as San Sebastiano in Pallaria. The palace may have been adjacent to the church.[72] The choice of the synod venue seemed to reflect the view that the main responsibility for holding synods fell more to the Emperor than to the Bishop of Rome.

However, a question arises as to how to reconcile this multitude of religious elements in the definition of the essence of imperial power with references to the ancient world. I have to reiterate that these references were more frequent and more emphatic than during the reigns of Otto I or Otto II. Of course, I realize that in late Antiquity and in the Middle Ages people did not see an irreconcilable opposition between the ancient world and Christianity, or at least they did not put the two cultural formations in such sharp contrast as it was usually done in the modern period. We also know that in the 4th century and for many following centuries people wanted to see the Roman Empire, even the pagan one, as a tool used by Providence to Christianize the world.

---

71   Eickhoff, *Kaiser Otto III.*, 313.

72   Brühl, "Die Kaiserpfalz," 24; Uhlirz, *Die Jahrbücher*, 349–352; Eickhoff, *Kaiser Otto III.*, 210; Caillet, "Les Horizons monumentaux," 691–693. Cf. however Warner, "Ideas and Action," 14–15. This scholar believes that the emperor chose the Palatine as his seat for reasons of security, the same reasons for which the synod was held on the Palatine. We cannot help wondering, however, whether it would not have been even safer to stay at Castel Sant'Angelo and hold the synod nearby, at the Vatican basilica.

However, does all this provide a satisfying explanation of the clear contrast between the very ecclesiastical nature of such imperial titles as *servus Iesu Christi* and *servus Apostolorum* on the one hand, and terms like *populus Romanus, Renovatio Imperii Romanorum* or *Roma aurea*, terms without any ecclesiastical references, on the other?

In order to explain this apparent paradox, it is enough to refer to the texts on which I have already commented. We need to bear in mind that Leo of Vercelli, when presenting his vision of a brave new world about to emerge, did not focus on religious facts, excluding secular facts or the other way round—on secular facts excluding religious facts. On the contrary, he wrote in the same breath about both, simply because they were inextricably linked. And so *Versus de Gregorio et Ottone Augusto* mentions the power and authority of Rome, the city's rights, the Empire and its glory, but the perspective opened by the author is unequivocally ecclesiastical. The readers can learn that Gregory cleanses the world of evil and together with Otto illuminates the entire earth. When the readers ask, thanks to whom the Eternal City regains its power and its rights, and thanks to whom it again enjoys great glory, they will learn that it is thanks to the pope, who is able to do it, because he acts as Peter's vicar. In this context the renewal of Rome consisting in a restitution of the Empire, becomes unequivocally religious, because it was caused by an intervention of the Prince of the Apostles and its ultimate goal was a Christian revival of the world.

Similar conclusions emerge from an analysis of the document for the Bishopric of Vercelli, which I have just quoted.[73] We find there the following chain of cause and effect: the privileges granted by Otto III to the diocese in question will ensure a safe existence for the Church, and the Church's safety will obtain prosperity for the Empire and power for the Roman nation. In turn, the greatness of the Empire and the Roman nation will pave the way for eternal salvation for Otto III.[74] It would be difficult to obtain a more unequivocal confirmation of the fact that for the monarch the idea of *Renovatio Imperii Romanorum* was thoroughly religious.

I have said earlier that the Summit of Gniezno was one of the events through which the idea of *Renovatio Imperii Romanorum* was put into practice. But what happened in Poland in the year 1000 was highly ecclesiastical in nature. It is not just about the fact that an archbishopric was created at the time and that the body of Adalbert, bishop and martyr, was placed in an altar. Even such an apparently secular act as the elevation of Bolesław Chrobry to

---

73   See the document to which footnote 38 refers.

74   See Jean-Marie Sansterre, "Otton III et les saints ascètes de son temps," *Rivista di Storia della Chiesa in Italia* 43 (1989): 386–387.

the rank of imperial associate was only apparently secular in nature. After all, we know that the tasks of this office involved helping the emperor with his apostolic duties. In other words, when including Poland in his Empire, Otto III did this hoping for further growth of Christianity.

The problem is that the concept of Rome, as it functioned in the 10th century and in the first half of the 11th century, encompassed a variety of elements. On the one hand, the City was considered to be the capital of the world, the political centre of a great empire encompassing the whole earth—an empire with its rich history, institutions and customs, which had not ceased to exist by any means. On the other hand, the City played an important role in the structure of the Western Church as its main centre with a bishop who was the first among the bishops of the world. Of crucial importance to the understanding of the concept in question is the apostolic character of the Eternal City. Rome was regarded as a city of St. Peter. The Prince of the Apostles had been its first bishop, this was where he had died as a martyr and this was where his mortal remains were buried. These facts were of consequence not only to the governance of the Church (the primacy of the pope). They were also the basis of views concerning the nature of the Empire, with people believing that the true steward of the imperial crown was St. Peter acting through the pope, that is, his vicar. Traces of this theory can be found in the *Life of St. Adalbert I*.

It is obvious that in such a situation the concept of Roman renewal contained a variety of elements, not always coherent from our point of view. It implied a restoration of former political power and cultural glory to the City, which was to be manifested by its hegemony in the world, and also a revival of old institutions and customs with their roots in pagan times. However, the concept in question also brought to mind an intensification of the religious role of the Roman Church. Both made up one, inseparable whole. Let us recall here the message of the poem addressed by Eugenius Vulgarius to Sergius III. The renewal of Rome undertaken by the papacy, an ecclesiastical institution, and successfully completed thanks to the prayer of St. Peter's vicar, was to lead to a restoration of curule seats and *fasces lictoriae*, of the glory of the Fabii and the Scipiones.

Because Otto III came up with a programme of *Renovatio Imperii Romanorum*, the programme had to contain a variety of postulates: some concerned political issues, like the rebuilding of Rome's hegemony in the world, others—a revival of old customs and institutions, flourishing of culture and learning; there were even those with some religious content. Among them was the will to carry the Word of God to the whole world and to strengthen Rome's position as an ecclesiastical centre.

In order to get a clearer picture of the co-existence and interpenetration of religious and political elements, of ecclesiastical ideas and ancient reminiscences in Otto III's political thought, we need to take a closer look at the monarch's attitude to the figure of Charlemagne. The problem is part of a broader problem of the attitude of the Saxons of the Liudolfingian era to the Carolingian past.[75]

The Saxons living in the second half of the 9th and the early 10th century felt a profound need mentally to come to terms with the traumatic memory of their very recent past. They realized very well that they had been conquered by Charlemagne. They knew that the conqueror had shed a sea of blood, bringing defeat, captivity and destruction to their homeland. On the other hand, they remembered that they owed the Christian faith to that emperor and that he had established a church organization in Saxony, encompassing a whole network of dioceses. Hence a certain ambivalence in their assessment of Charlemagne, an inclination to emphasize the positive role played by the monarch in their history. They wanted to believe that if he had waged war against them for many years, it had only been to make them accept the Christian faith, and that, guided by this intention, he had been more willing to resort to peaceful measures than to war. Some Saxon writers turned Charlemagne into an apostle.[76] The Poet Saxo went especially far in his apotheosis; he was an anonymous author writing with the intention of offering his work to the East Frankish king, Arnulf.

All these efforts were to provide mental comfort for the conquered nation: they still lived in the Frankish kingdom ruled by the Carolingians and the idea was to accept this situation without renouncing one's own identity.

The political transformations that occurred in the 10th century changed to some extent the way in which the Saxons viewed their past. In the newly reconstructed kingdom of the East Franks, ruled by the Liudolfingians, the Saxons exercised hegemony, which enabled them to become more detached about their painful historical experiences. They no longer brooded over

---

75   An attempt to provide a synthetic overview is made by Keller, "Die Ottonen," 112–131; see also Helmut Beumann, "Die Hagiographie "bewältigt": Unterwerfung und Christianisierung der Sachsen durch Karl den Grossen", in *Cristianizzazione ed organizzazione ecclesiastica delle campagne nell'alto medioevo. Espansione e resistenze*, vol. 1, Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo 28/₁ (Spoleto: Presso la Sede del Centro, 1982), 129–163; Ernst-Dieter Hehl, "Herrscher, Kirche und Kirchenrecht im spätottonischen Reich," in *Otto III.—Heinrich II. eine Wende?*, 186–203; Falkenstein, *Otto III. und Aachen*, passim; Görich, "Otto III. öffnet das Karlsgrab," 381–430; idem, "Kaiser Otto III. und Aachen," in *Europas Mitte um 1000*, vol. 2, 786–791.

76   Beumann, "Die Hagiographie," especially 139–145.

their defeats at the hands of the Franks, but were happy that they were now collaborating with them on their own terms. Of course they knew that their kingdom was a continuation of the Carolingian state, but were largely justified in maintaining that it was thanks to them, especially thanks to Henry I, that this kingdom had not fallen but had been revived and was shining with a long-forgotten splendour. The Franks' merit in this respect was insignificant.

At the same time the Saxons were successfully expanding to the east and north-east, a process accompanied by missionary efforts culminating in the founding of a whole host of bishoprics in pagan territories: among the Polabian Slavs and in Denmark. In addition, they were also victorious in their confrontation with the pagan Hungarians; therefore, they had the right to see themselves as defenders of Christianity. Even the Holy See confirmed them in their conviction. Under the influence of these new experiences they changed somewhat their attitude to Charlemagne's role in the evangelization of Saxony. They could not erase him completely from the history of Christianization of their own nation, that was obvious, but they put the main emphasis on the voluntary conversion of Widukind, their great hero and up to a certain point a fierce enemy of the Frankish monarch. It was not true—the Saxons claimed— that the emperor had forced their ancestors to accept Christianity; they themselves, following their leader, had wanted to accept the Christian religion. We know very well how far this view was from the truth.

As a result, the importance of Charlemagne seemed to diminish in the collective memory of the Saxon ruling elite. This was certainly the case during the reign of Otto I and his son Otto II. Of course, it would be easy to cite facts showing that the figure of the Frankish emperor did play a role in the political consciousness in those days. First of all, the position of Aachen in the Liudolfingian monarchy is highly significant. Otto I considered it to be the greatest capital of the kingdom on this side of the Alps;[77] in addition, he expressed a wish that the superior (*abbas*) of the canons serving God in the local chapel would always be a cleric previously belonging to the royal *capella*.[78] However, above all we need to take into account the fact that during the reign of the Liudolfingians this was the coronation venue of the German kings. It is all the more significant given the fact that Aachen did not have a cathedral and the events inaugurating the royal rule took place in the palace chapel. The anointment and coronation ceremony was *par excellence* a pontifical liturgy and should have taken place in an episcopal or even an archiepiscopal church. It seems that a departure from this rule must have been dictated by

---

77   DO I, no. 316, 430.

78   DO I, no. 417, 569.

the conviction that the king should be made in Aachen, because the city had been Charlemagne's capital and the local palace chapel was his resting place.[79]

On the other hand, there is no information suggesting that Otto I held Charlemagne emperor in any special regard, that he wanted to emulate him or was guided by some affection for him. The same can be said with regard to Otto II. Of course, Otto I knew that the chapel in question had been built by Charlemagne and considered this to be his predecessor's claim to glory. Significantly, however, in the document in which he mentions the role of the Frankish emperor in the founding of the chapel he expresses no concern for the peace of his soul. He makes the donation mentioned in the diploma for various people, living and dead, but he is silent about Charlemagne in this context.[80]

Otto III's attitude was completely different. Firstly, there is evidence to show that he tried to emulate the political programme of the great Frankish ruler. We know already that the motto *Renovatio Imperii Romanorum* was borrowed from the restorer of the Roman Empire in the West and that Otto used his *bulla* as a model for his first lead seal. There are also other sources demonstrating that Otto III was highly interested in Charlemagne. Indeed, they even make it possible for us to speak of a fascination of sorts.

Thus, when giving some landed estates to the Aachen chapel, he mentioned—like his grandfather before him—that it had been founded by Charlemagne, but, unlike Otto I, he made the donation for the Frankish king; not only for him, that is true, but the fact is that he did not forget about him.[81] However, the most convincing evidence of the young monarch's affection for his famous predecessor on the imperial throne is provided by the following event. Otto III was returning from his Gniezno pilgrimage through Aachen. He stopped there and began looking for the site of Charlemagne's tomb, because no one remembered where his burial place was. Eventually, the location was established and on Whitsun 1000 the emperor broke into the tomb with a group of his closest associates. He took with him a fragment of the dead ruler's robe, the cross resting on his breast and perhaps also a piece of his mortal remains—evidence provided by the sources differs—and closed the tomb

---

79   Otto I was well aware of these facts, see ibid.

80   DO I, no. 316, 430.

81   DO III, no. 257–258, 674–676.

again.[82] Another account states that the participants were enveloped by a pleasant fragrance and that the monarch wrapped the body in a white robe.[83]

The meaning of this act, which filled people with anxiety or even terror, is still the subject of some controversy in historiography. Helmut Beumann sees it as an attempt to follow ancient customs.[84] According to this scholar's interpretation, Otto III was apparently following the example of Caesar and Augustus or Caligula, who had visited the resting place of Alexander the Great; Augustus even had the tomb opened on that occasion. Caligula, in turn, wore the breastplate previously covering the body of the Macedonian king. These were well known facts in Otto III's times, because information about them had been provided by Lucan and Suetonius, two Roman authors popular at the time.[85] Thietmar interpreted the analyzed event as yet another manifestation of a revival of long-forgotten ancient customs.[86]

There is another plausible interpretation. Knut Görich has recently devoted an extensive treatise to its justification. In his view, Otto intended to proclaim Charlemagne a saint,[87] and the initial stages of the canonization process required that the resting place of the relics be ascertained and that the relics be examined. Thus Otto set himself the same goal as Frederick Barbarossa a century and a half later, the difference being that the latter carried out his plan to the end.[88] Otto did not manage to achieve that. First of all, he died a year and a half after the events at Aachen. He had, thus, little time to see to the matter, and when he died, there was no one to replace him. In any case, the monarch's initiative may not have been well received in ecclesiastical circles. The problem was that in the light of early medieval norms, Charlemagne did not meet the conditions expected from a saint. He was neither a martyr, nor an

---

82   Thietmar, lib. IV, cap. 47, 184–186; *Chronicon Novaliciense*, ed. Gian Carlo Alessio, Turin: Einaudi, 1982, lib. III, cap. 32, 182. The author of the least reliable account of the opening of Charlemagne's tomb, Ademar of Chabannes, claims that the body of the Frankish ruler was elevated at the time (*Ademari Cabannensis Chronicon*, lib. III, cap. 31, 153, version γ).

83   *Chronicon Novaliciense*, loc. cit.

84   Helmut Beumann, "Grab und Thron Karls des Großen zu Aachen," 1st ed. 1967, in idem, *Wissenschaft vom Mittelalter*, 347–376, especially 371–372.

85   Lucan, *Bellum civile*, 10, 14–21. Suetonius, *Divus Augustus*, 18; *Caligula*, 52.

86   Thietmar, lib. IV, cap. 47, 184–186.

87   Görich, "Otto III. öffnet," passim. This hypothesis appeared in the literature even earlier, see Danuta Borawska, *Kryzys monarchii wczesnopiastowskiej w latach trzydziestych XI w.* (Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1964), 131. Some reservations with regard to Görich's thesis have been raised by L. Falkenstein, who does not reject it, however, Falkenstein, *Otto III. und Aachen*, 163–164.

88   Petersohn, "Saint Denis—Westminster—Aachen", 420–454.

ascetic. The time of canonization of confessor kings had not come yet—it was not until the 12th century that they began to be made saints. The canonization of the Hungarian king, St. Stephen the Confessor, in the second half of the previous century was an exception.

It is not easy to determine which of the interpretations presented here is the correct one. On the one hand, some facts indeed bring to mind customs associated with the cult of saints at the time: Otto tried hard to find the place in which Charlemagne was buried, he wrapped his body in a precious robe and took with him contact relics and maybe even bodily relics as well. The information about a strong fragrance suggests a hagiographic stylization of the Italian account.[89] There was no ceremonious elevation of the relics and placing them in an altar or behind it, but this would have been a formal act of canonization and for various reasons it was too early for it. Rather, the whole event should be seen as a preparatory stage.

On the other hand, Thietmar's position is worrying. There must have been little talk in the Germen Church of Charlemagne's sainthood, since the Bishop of Merseburg, a man well-versed in the cult of saints by virtue of his education and his office, offered his readers such an extraordinary interpretation, drawing on the customs of ancient Caesars. It would be difficult to imagine that in planning the canonization of the Frankish king the emperor did not consult with members of the German episcopate, and that this did not cause any discussion, at least behind the closed doors. Similar conclusions emerge from an analysis of the *Hildesheim Annals*.[90] Their author did not even think that Otto III might have regarded the Frankish ruler as a saint. According the annalist's interpretation, the German king was guided by curiosity and in opening the tomb he committed a crime for which he was punished by heaven. Curiosity is not an act of homage paid to the saint, and recognition of relics does not deserve to be punished by God.[91]

We shall not solve our dilemma here. But we have to agree about one thing: Charlemagne was certainly a person that fascinated the young monarch.

A separate chapter in the history of Otto III's reign is taken up by Aachen. There is no doubt that the city was very important to the emperor. In the

---

89   Ademar of Chabannes goes even further in that direction (*Ademari Cabannensis Chronicon*, lib. III, cap. 31, 153, version γ). The chronicler writes about three-day fasting preceding the invention of the body, about a vision thanks to which Otto III knew where the body was to be found, and about miracles happening after the elevation at Charlemagne's tomb.

90   *Annales Hildesheimenses*, 28 (under the year 1000).

91   See Falkenstein, *Otto III. und Aachen*, 163–164.

document for the Aachen palace chapel, the ruler emphatically stresses that his throne is to be found in that church.[92] Noteworthy are also opinions expressed by some authors living contemporaneously with Otto III but writing a few or over ten years after his death. From the *Quedlinburg Annals* we learn that apart from Rome, Aachen was closer to the emperor's heart than all other cities.[93] In the *Life of Henry II* Adalbold of Utrecht says that his protagonist's predecessor loved the Virgin Mary Church in Aachen in an exceptional manner.[94] Moreover, we have a statement by Otto himself concerning the matter.[95] In any case, evidence comes from Otto's actions.

While Otto's father and grandfather rarely came to Aachen and stayed there only briefly, he himself during his independent rule tried to stay there as often and as long as possible, whenever he was in the northern part of his Empire. He had an artist brought from Italy to decorate the palace chapel with paintings, but, first of all, he obtained extraordinary papal privileges for it. Granting the emperor's request, Gregory V in his bull of 8 February 997 established in the chapel a college of cardinals encompassing seven deacons and seven priests. At the same time, he ordered that no one be allowed to celebrate mass at the Virgin Mary's altar except for those clerics and the Archbishop of Cologne and Bishop of Liège (respectively: the metropolitan for the Diocese of Liège and the local bishop).[96] In addition, he took the landed estates of this ecclesiastical institution under his care on condition that in exchange it paid a pound of pure gold to the Holy See on an annual basis. In that period it would sometimes happen, tho.ugh not very often, that a pope would establish, as a sign of his great grace, a college of cardinals at a selected cathedral, in Trier or Magdeburg; I have mentioned this in the previous chapter. However, in this case this concerned not the main church of the archbishopric and the metropolitan see, but a chapel. Some scholars have also pointed out that the rent to be paid by Aachen to the papal treasury was much higher than in other similar cases. It is worth noting, for the sake of comparison, that the Abbey of Quedlinburg, under papal protection since Otto I's times, also paid a pound, but of silver. This last detail shows how highly ranked as a church the Aachen chapel was to be and how richly endowed it was to be.

Yet Otto III's activity in Aachen was not focused only on the palace chapel. The emperor founded there no fewer than three monasteries: of the Monks of

---

92   DO III, no. 347, 776.

93   *Annales Hildesheimenses*, 77 (under the year 1000).

94   *Vita Heinrici II. imperatoris auctore Adalboldo*, MGH SS, vol. 4, ed. G. Waitz, cap. 4, 684.

95   DO III, no. 347, 776.

96   *Papsturkunden*, vol. 2, no. 340, 663–664.

St. Nicholas, of St. Adalbert and of the Benedictine Nuns of St. Saviour. With these foundations in mind, he brought there precious relics: of St. Adalbert, of St. Corona and of St. Leonard.[97] Therefore, it would not be an exaggeration to say that the monarch decided to carry out a large scale urban development venture in Aachen. What were his motives? He probably wanted to transform a residential centre into a true city, a *civitas*, which, in accordance with the ideas of the period, had to have a greater number of churches. But there may have been another reason as well, not necessarily contradicting the first one. The emperor may have wanted to surround the central object, namely the palace chapel of the Virgin Mary, with other religious edifices, following urban planning principles commonly accepted at the time. In addition, we need to take into account a practical factor: when developing Aachen as a capital city, the ruler had to ensure a solid material base for it. New monasteries and a rich endowment for the palace chapel were needed, if only to provide accommodation and board for more people. The German kings liked to exercise their right of lodging.[98]

A hypothesis has recently been put forward according to which Otto III intended to found a bishopric with its see in Aachen.[99] The premises invoked by Ernst-Dieter Hehl may not be sufficiently unequivocal and solid for the view in question to be shared without any reservations, but I have to admit that the facts I have just mentioned correspond well to such a concept. Of particular significance is the establishment of the college of cardinals. The idea was, first of all, to make the liturgy at the chapel of the Virgin Mary as similar to the Roman liturgy as possible. However, in the latter the central role was played by the pope, that is to say a bishop. Thus, emulating Rome was impossible, if Aachen were not made a diocesan see. In this we have to realize that the founding of a bishopric by Otto III would not have been unusual. On the contrary, it would have fitted in well with the founding activity of the Saxon kings. Suffice it to mention Otto I, the founder of the Archbishopric of Magdeburg and several other bishoprics, as well as Henry II, who founded the Diocese of Bamberg.

---

97 Recently about the subject: Falkenstein, *Otto III. und Aachen*, 112–129 and passim.

98 Ibid., 166–167.

99 Hehl, "Herrscher, Kirche," 186–203; see however notable objections by Falkenstein, *Otto III. und Aachen*, 85–97 and favourable opinion of Hehl's concept by Keller, "Die Ottonen," 128. It is worth remembering that K. Maleczyński once suggested that Otto III had intended to found an archbishopric in Aachen ("W sprawie zjazdu gnieźnieńskiego," 521). However, his was a false premise, i.e. an erroneously interpreted title of *archiepiscopus sancti Adalberti*; see Chapter II, point 2. In my analysis I follow Hehl's argumentation.

We also know that Otto III was buried in the choir of the chapel of the Virgin Mary. It would seem that the monarch intended to found a funeral cathedral in which his mortal remains would be laid to rest. Again, very close analogies come to mind: Otto I's sepulchre was in the Magdeburg metropolitan cathedral he had founded, while that of Henry II—the Bamberg cathedral founded by him. However, in this case we need to be very careful. We cannot say with absolute certainty whether Otto III really wanted to be buried in the Aachen chapel. After all, when he died he was cut off from the rebellious Rome. It is, therefore, possible that he had chosen the Eternal City, his greatest love, to be his final resting place, but for the reason mentioned above his wish could not be complied with. His father's tomb was at St. Peter's in the Vatican, as we know.

There is no doubt that Otto III's fascination with Aachen was combined with his veneration for Charlemagne. His attitude towards Aachen and his attitude towards the Frankish ruler determined and strengthened each other. Highly telling in this respect is an imperial document of 6 February 1000 in which the monarch offers specific estates "cardinalibus et canonicis et cunctis fratribus sacrosancte ecclesie Aquisgranensis in honore sancte dei genitricis Marie et sancte resurrectionis constructe, ubi nostra sedes ab antecessore nostro, scilicet Karolo famosissimo imperatore augusto, constituta atque ordinata esse dinoscitur [. . .]".[100] The ruler explains why he makes the donation to the Aachen chapel: this is where his throne or, rather, his more abstractly defined capital, is to be found. But at the same time he adds that the throne and the capital were established there by the famous emperor Charles. His attachment to this seat and, consequently, to Aachen as a symbol of power implied Otto's veneration for the monarch who had placed his imperial capital there. On the other hand, the cult of that monarch raised the value of the seat and the chapel in the eyes of the German king, because the seat had been placed there by such an outstanding ruler.

I have already said—and the data cited here fully confirm this—that Otto III's reign was marked by a return of the fascination with the figure of Charlemagne. What were its causes? The awareness of the obvious fact that the German king was an heir of the famous king of the Franks was naturally of prime importance, but this in itself is not sufficient as an explanation. The father and grandfather of our protagonist knew very well that their predecessors included Charlemagne, and yet they were not really interested in him.

---

100   DO III, no. 347, 776 ("[. . .] to the cardinals, canons, and all brothers of the sacrosanct church of Aachen, built in honour of the holy Mother of God Mary and the holy Resurrection, where our see is known to have been established and ordained by our predecessor, namely by Charles, the most famour emperor Augustus").

The key to solving this problem is provided by the following facts. The first is to be found in the *Annals of Quedlinburg*, a source originating in the monastery of St. Servatius' canonesses in 1007–1008 and then continued by the same author on a regular basis.[101] This was a milieu closely linked to Otto III. Until as late as 999 the abbey was headed by Abbess Matilda, the young emperor's aunt. There must have been a considerable unity of thoughts and views between her and her nephew, if the monarch appointed the lady his deputy in Saxony when he set out on his second Roman expedition. At the same time he gave Matilda the title of "matricia", which is not found anywhere else and which must have been the female equivalent of patrician. The abbess must have greatly appreciated the office, if the inscription placed on the lid of her coffin includes information about it.[102]

When Matilda died, the emperor appointed his sister Adelaide the abbess. Adelaide governed the Quedlinburg convent until as late as 1045 and there is no doubt that the siblings understood each other very well. A contemporary observer wrote emphatically about the love between the brother and the sister.[103] We also know that the abbess accompanied the emperor almost constantly during his stay in Germany in 1000, that is, at a time when the monarch was making and implementing his long-term political plans. It would be difficult to believe in such a situation that the ideas and views which were close to Otto and which were planted in Quedlinburg in Matilda's times were not cultivated under Abbess Adelaide. We are also justified in thinking that much of this atmosphere may have survived the emperor's death and found its way to the *Annals* written several years later.

Indeed, the annalist (who may have been a woman)[104] wrote approvingly about Otto III's policy and about the close bond between him and Adelaide. On the other hand, the annalist repeatedly expressed his or her disapproval

101   For more on this source, see Robert Holtzmann, "Die Quedlinburger Annalen," 1st edition 1925, in idem, *Aufsätze zur deutschen Geschichte im Mittelelberaum*, ed. Albrecht Timm (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1962, 193–254; Wattenbach and Holtzmann, *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen*, 44–46; Wojtecki, "Slavica beim Annalisten von Quedlinburg," passim; Gerd Althoff, "Gandersheim und Quedlinburg. Ottonische Frauenklöster als Herrschafts- und Überliferungszentren," *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 25 (1991): 123–144, especially from 142.

102   Edmund E. Stengel, "Die Grabschrift der ersten Äbtissin von Quedlinburg," *Deutsches Archiv für Geschichte des Mittelalters* 3 (1939): 361–370, edition of inscription on 362.

103   *Annales Quedlinburgenses*, 77 (under the year 1000).

104   Elisabeth van Houts, "Women and the Writing of History in the Early Middle Ages: the Case of Abbess Matilda of Essen and Aethelweard," *Early Medieval Europe* 1 (1992): 53–68, especially 58.

of Henry II and his rule. The annalist's attitude to him changed only after the conclusion of the Peace of Bautzen in 1018.[105] The political views expressed in the annals are the best evidence of how highly Otto III's ideological legacy was valued in Quedlinburg. Of course, the hostile attitude to Henry may have had its source in the fact that the king did not show his favour to the Quedlinburg monastery. While during the reigns of the previous rulers from the Saxon dynasty the monastery was at the centre of life of the monarchy, now it found itself completely sidelined.[106] But this was exactly an atmosphere in which attachment to the idea symbolized by Otto III could easily be consolidated.

The *Annals of Quedlinburg*, which the author intended to deal with world history, provide us with an overview of history since the creation of the world. A lot of space is devoted there to the figure of Charlemagne. From our point of view worthy of note is the fact that the annals restore the rank of Christianizer and apostle to the emperor. A separate entry is devoted to each year of his reign. It is, therefore, not surprising that the annals keep returning again and again to the matter of Frankish-Saxon relations. Whenever possible, the annalist brings to light the role of the emperor in the Christianization of the Saxons.[107] Under the year 814, in an obituary entry, the annalist writes: "Carolus imperator et Saxonum apostolus 5. Calend. Februarii obiit […]".[108]

The figure of Charlemagne as a Christianizer appears also in the writings of another Saxon, a person closely linked to Otto III. That writer is Bruno of Querfurt. He was very severe when assessing kings and emperors; among the many charges he levelled at them was one of not being interested in the spread of the Gospel among the pagans. True, there are exceptions from this sad rule and the author mentions them: Constantine and the king of the Franks, Charles.[109] What is more, he holds them up as examples to Henry II, whom he urges to become worthy of the name of apostle.[110] This should be understood

---

105   See Holtzmann, "Die Quedlinburger Annalen," 239–241, 253–254. That scholar was inclined to look for the causes of the change in the assessment of Henry II in a possibility for Polish-German collaboration that had opened up in 1018. This interpretation is doubtful, if we take into account the annalist's very negative attitude to Bolesław Chrobry; see Wojtecki, "Slavica," 187–194.

106   Althoff, "Gandersheim und Quedlinburg," 142–144.

107   See entries under the years 772, 776, 780, 781, 781, 793 and 803 (*Annales Quedlinburgenses*, 37–41).

108   Ibid., 41 ("On the 28th of January Charles, Emperor and apostle of the Saxons, died").

109   *Adalberti Vita II*, cap. 10, 10; *Epistola Brunonis*, 104. I write more on this topic in Chapter II, point 6.

110   *Epistola Brunonis*, 104.

as expressing Bruno's opinion that both Constantine and Charlemagne were apostles.

I have pointed out earlier that Otto III opened the tomb of his great predecessor on his way back from Gniezno and that he did this around Whitsuntide.[111] As we know, the emperor came to Aachen preoccupied with the apostolic mission which he had just completed. Thus, the fascination with the figure of Charlemagne, expressed in this extraordinary event, may have been based on the fact that the Frankish king was regarded as an apostle. We do not know how significant the day on which the event occurred was, because the monarch's stay in Aachen at Whitsun and in the period preceding it may have been dictated by purely practical considerations. However, if this was not the case and Otto III indeed deliberately chose that date, this means that for him the hero he venerated was an apostle. The church feast in question commemorates the mystery of the descent of the Holy Spirit on the College of the Twelve, the objective of which was, among others, to preach the Gospel to all nations (gift of the tongues).

Another trace of this fascination is to be found in the fact that the emperor made the donation for the peace of Charlemagne's soul in October 997, after he learned of St. Adalbert's death. There is a possible and even highly plausible interpretation of that fact. The martyrdom of the Bishop of Prague during his mission among the Prussians contributed to the consolidation of Otto III's political views. From this point onwards he attached more weight than before to the evangelization of the pagans, considering it to be an important task for him as a ruler. If so, he looked at his famous predecessor in a new light and began to value him even more highly on account of his apostolic merits.[112] This of course does not mean that the young ruler's veneration for the famous king of the Franks emerged only after St. Adalbert's death. After all, his interest in Aachen, inextricably linked to the cult of Charlemagne, dates back to an earlier period. Suffice it to mention that the papal privilege establishing a college of cardinals in the palace chapel was granted in February 997.

I have gathered enough evidence to be able to say that Otto III, when looking at Charlemagne, saw him as an apostle and that he regarded his apostolicity as an important factor. Yet we know that when trying to emulate his famous predecessor, he drew on the idea of renewal of the Roman Empire. This is evidenced by the motto *Renovatio Imperii Romanorum*, analyzed earlier,

---

111   Bömer, *Regesta Imperii*, no. 2, no. 1370 b, 760.

112   For more on Otto III's attitude to Charlemagne's apostolicity, see Beumann, "Die Hagiographie," 144–145; on the link between St. Adalbert's death and the emperor's veneration for Charlemagne, see Görich, "Kaiser Otto III. und Aachen," 790.

taken over from the old emperor's *bulla*. We need to bear in mind that the German ruler placed this motto on his seal after St. Adalbert's death and after the foundation made for the eternal salvation of the Frankish ruler. In other words—when Otto discovered his missionary vocation, he became even more attached to Charlemagne, another great missionary. But in following in his footsteps, he did not limit himself only to this single aspect of his activity. Charlemagne performed the duties of an apostle and, more broadly, a Christian ruler as an emperor and thanks to the fact that he was an emperor. We can even say that his successes in the religious sphere were possible because he had renewed the Empire, that is, had restored to it the glory it had enjoyed in Antiquity. Otto III drew specific conclusions from this: in order to be an apostle and a ruler strengthening Christianity and the Church, he had to renew the Imperium Romanum. As we can see, it was impossible to separate the religious aspect from the political aspect, and the ecclesiastical aspect from the secular one.[113]

I have now said many times that the idea of reviving the Roman Empire carried with it a rich message, in which an important place was occupied by ecclesiastical content, alongside political components. The sequence of events: St. Adalbert's death—foundation made for Charlemagne—the *bulla* with the motto *Renovatio Imperii Romanorum* demonstrates, let me repeat once again, that what directly prompted Otto III to undertake the renewal was the religious factor. We can go a step further and say that the factor in question set the tone for the entire venture. Let us remember that even the bond forged between Bolesław Chrobry and the emperor was modelled on the bond between St. Paul and Epaphroditus. Although the iconographic programme of the imperial *bullae* and the content of inscriptions stamped on them avoided Christian references, this resulted from the fact that they were imitations.

Summing up the conclusions from the present subchapter, I would like to firmly say that, contrary to some recently expressed opinions,[114] in his

---

113 See Hlawitschka, "Otto III.," 42 with fn. 30, where the author mentions opinions by chroniclers stating that the emperor wanted to renew both the Church and the Empire.

114 This is a reference mainly to Görich, *Otto III.*, passim. The scholar is inclined to deny any originality of the emperor's political thought. There is an internal contradiction in Althoff's biography, *Otto III.* On the one hand, Althoff does not go as far as Görich but he does try to minimize the differences between the personality and political concepts of this emperor and those of his predecessor and immediate successors. Yet he ends his book with a completely unexpected conclusion: "Doch in seinen sieben Lebensjahren als mündiger Herrscher gab er mehr Proben und Beweise seiner Individualität ab als andere Herrscher in langen Dezennien. Manchmal hat man fast den Eindruck, als ob er selbst dann den Konventionen einen individuellen Stempel aufdrückte, wenn er sich ihnen

political concepts Otto III was markedly different from other German kings in the 10th century. I mean here both his stronger—than his predecessors'—emphasis on the idea of Roman renewal, and his greater emphasis on a monarch's ecclesiastical duties. The question of the originality of the emperor's personality and views will accompany us also later on in the present chapter.

2   The Spirit of Asceticism and Penance

Otto III devoted himself to religious practices with great zeal. This is pointed out by Thietmar, who writes as follows:

> All of the regions pertaining to the Romans and Lombards remained faithfully subject to [the emperor's] dominion, the only exception was Rome which he had loved above all others and always honoured. The emperor rejoiced when Archbishop Heribert of Cologne arrived with a large retinue. But though he outwardly assumed a cheerful expression, his inner conscience groaned under the weight of many misdeeds from which, in the silence of night, he continually sought to cleanse himself through vigils, earnest prayers, and rivers of tears. Often he spent the whole week in fasts, except for Thursdays, and he was very generous with alms.[115]

---

gemäss verhielt" (211, see also 188, 189). This peculiarity of Althoff's book has been pointed out by reviewers: Michael Borgolte, "Biographie ohne Subjekt, oder wie man durch quellenfixierte Arbeit Opfer des Zeitgeistes werden kann," *Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen* 249 (1997): 128–141, especially 138; Franz-Reiner Erkens, "Mirabilia mundi". Ein kritischer Versuch über ein methodisches Problem und eine neue Deutung der Herrschaft Ottos III.," *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte* 79 (1997): 485–498, especially 497.

115   English translation by Warner, *Ottonian Germany*, 186.—"Omnes regiones, quae Romanos et Longobardos respiciebant, suae dominacioni fideliter subditas, Roma solum, quam pre caeteris diligebat ac semper excolebat, excepta, habebat. Conveniente tum cum Heriberto, sanctae Agripinae archiepiscopo, plurima fidelium turma, inperator laetatur; et quamvis exterius vultu semper hilari se simularet, tamen conscientiae secreto plurima ingemiscens facinora, noctis silentio vigiliis oracionibusque intentis, lacrimarum quoque rivis abluere non desistit. Sepenumero omnem ebdomadam excepta V. feria ieiunus perducens, in elemosinis valde largus exstitit" (Thietmar, lib. IV, cap. 48, 186). A competent and detailed analysis of these words is carried out by Stephan Waldhoff, "Der Kaiser in der Krise? Zum Verständnis von Thietmar IV 48," *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters* 54 (1998), 23–54.

The chronicler writes about Otto's piety in the context of a specific event. In late autumn 1001, shortly before the emperor's death, some military rein- forcements came to help the emperor subjugate the rebellious Romans. We might conclude from this that it was only then, towards the very end of his life, that the ruler got carried away by religious zeal. This conclusion would lead to another one, namely that this zeal was caused by a profound mental crisis caused by a rebellion of the City which the young monarch loved and for which he had ambitious political plans;[116] a rebellion, let me add, which the emperor was unable to get under control for months. However, this would be an erroneous conclusion. According to the rules of rhetoric, a moral portrayal of a hero was to be placed just before a description of his death. If we take into account the fact that the emperor's death is mentioned in the very next sentence, we will conclude that Thietmar simply wanted to conform to these rules.[117] He wrote about ascetic practices in the context of the last events in the monarch's life not because the ruler had only just taken up these practices but because this was recommended by literary authorities.

On the other hand, there is evidence to show that Otto III had displayed zealous piety earlier, many months before the last rebellion of the Romans. Let us, therefore, review the source material shedding light on the emperor's ascetic practices and let us try to establish their chronology, nature and context.

In 999, during Lent, the emperor went on a pilgrimage to St. Michael's sanctuary on Monte Gargano.[118] We learn about this from several sources, two of which are particularly worthy of note: *Life of St. Romuald* and *Life of St. Nilus*. In the *Life of St. Romuald* the matter of the pilgrimage appears in the context of Crescentius's condemnation and execution. As we know, that Roman aristocrat removed Gregory V, a pope established by Otto III, and put Johannes Philagathos on the throne of St. Peter. The emperor considered this to be high treason and when he returned to Rome from Germany, he laid siege to Castel Sant'Angelo in which Crescentius had taken refuge and which was commonly regarded as a fortress that could not be captured. The sources agree as to the fact that eventually the monarch took the rebel captive and had him executed, but they differ in their descriptions of the circumstances in which Crescentius was caught.[119] Peter Damian believes that the senator fell victim to a stratagem. Tammo, Otto III's confidant and friend, promised Crescentius under oath that

---

116   The is the view of Schramm, *Kaiser, Rom und Renovatio*, 179–180.

117   Waldhoff, "Der Kaiser," 40–54.

118   Uhlirz, *Otto III.*, 290–292, 534–537.

119   See Althoff, *Otto III.*, 105–114.

if he surrendered, he would be pardoned by the emperor. However, he acted in bad faith, just like the monarch, who had persuaded him to use the stratagem.[120]

Tammo was among those people whom Romuald took from the world and persuaded to dedicate their lives entirely to God. The hagiographer maintains that the conversion of the German aristocrat was a form of penance imposed for perjury. But the emperor was also to blame, so when he confessed his sin to Romuald, the confessor told him to go on a penitential pilgrimage to Monte Gargano. This is a version of events presented by Peter Damian.[121]

The anonymous author of the second *vita* (he was a disciple of St. Nilus,[122] and the work itself was written just a few years after the master's death) also refers to the events associated with Crescentius's rebellion and Philagathos's usurpation, the difference being that he focuses not on the fate of the senator but on that of the antipope.[123] The Man of God was very pained to hear about the severe punishment imposed on the usurper. He went to Rome and asked Otto III and Gregory V to give the wretched man over to him. Yet he was unable to achieve anything; on the contrary, Philagathos was subjected to more elaborate torments and humiliation. The saint abandoned further efforts, but warned the emperor and the pope that they could not hope for their sins to be taken away by the Lord, since they had not showed mercy to their enemy. Soon after that Gregory V was murdered and Otto went on foot on a penitential pilgrimage to Monte Gargano. However, he did not escape God's punishment. As soon as he returned to Rome, an uprising against him broke out and he himself died when fleeing the rebels.

As we can see, the *Life of St. Nilus*, too, tells us that Otto III's pilgrimage was an act of expiation. Although the hagiographer does not explicitly say that it was a form of satisfaction for the cruel mutilation of the antipope, the context

---

120   *Vita b. Romualdi*, cap. 25, 52–54.

121   Ibid., cap. 25, 53: "Erat enim predictus imperator monastico ordini valde benivolus et nimia circa Dei famulos affectione devotus. Ipse autem ex eodem crimine beato viro confessus, pęnitentię causa nudis pedibus de Romana Urbe progrediens, sic usque Garganum montem ad sancti Michaelis perrexit ęcclesiam" ("Indeed, the aforementioned emperor was very favourably disposed to the monastic order and greatly devoted in his affections to the servants of God. Moreover, he himself, having been confessed for that transgression by the holy man, went from the city of Rome on his bare feet as a penance and thus walked to St Michael's Church on Mons Garganus").

122   For more on the author and dating of the work, see Jean-Marie Sansterre, "Les Coryphées des apôtres et la papauté dans les Vies des saints Nil et Barthélemy de Grottaferrata," *Byzantion* 55 (1985), no. 2: 517–520.

123   *Ex Vita sancti Nili*, ed. Georg Heinrich Pertz, MGH SS, vol. 4, cap. 89–93, 616–618.

in which he writes about the matter seems to be suggesting that this is how he understood the case.

Yet there is no doubt that the view of both hagiographers is erroneous.[124] Other, more reliable sources do not suggest by any means that Otto III was plagued by remorse caused by Crescentius and Philagathos's torment. On the contrary, the monarch was more inclined to boast about it and generously rewarded his confidants responsible for the fate of the condemned men.[125] It would be impossible not to mention here Otto III's diploma for the monastery in Einsiedeln. The document contains the following dating formula: "actum Romae, quando Crescentius decollatus suspensus fuit".[126] The person directly responsible for the mutilation of the antipope was Count Birichtilo (Berthold). Not only did he not fall into disfavour, but, on the contrary, over the next few months he was granted many favours by the emperor. On 29 March 999 the monarch granted him the right to hold a market, mint coins and collect tolls at his estate in Villingen (in the Black Forest). This must be regarded as a sign of extraordinary grace, given the fact that no layman before him had been granted a market privilege by the king of Germany. Another evidence of the monarch's high appreciation for the count: when in February that year Matilda, the Quendlinburg abbess died, Otto III chose his own sister Adelaide to become her successor. He sent Birichtilo to Quedlinburg as his representative to invest the new abbess on behalf of the emperor by giving her a gold crosier.

It must also be said that when it comes to Crescentius's case, there are other, very important arguments as well. The circumstances of the senator's capture are presented in the sources in a variety of ways and it seems that the version given by Peter Damian is completely wrong. On the other hand, a credible account is provided by Rudolf Glaber, according to whom neither Otto III nor anyone else promised the senator personal inviolability. Castel Sant'Angelo was simply captured by the imperial forces and Crescentius was caught.[127] Therefore, the monarch cannot be said to have been guilty of perjury, which was supposedly the reason why he had to do penance.

The conclusion that comes to mind is as follows. The pilgrimage to Monte Gargano may have been penitential, which would be suggested by the fact that the monarch covered part of the route on foot (according to the *Life of St. Nilus*) or even walked barefoot, according to Peter Damian. However, this was by no

---

124   Althoff, *Otto III*., 101–114; also Trawkowski, "Pielgrzymka Ottona III," 108–112 and passim.

125   I refer here to the results of research conducted by Althoff, loc. cit.

126   DO III, no. 285, 710 ("Given at Rome, when Crescentius was hung and decapitated").

127   Raoul Glaber, *Histoires*, ed. Mathieu Arnoux, Miroir du Moyen Age (Turnhout: Brepols,, 1996), lib. I, cap. 12, 60–64. I refer to the reconstruction of facts by Althoff, *Otto III*., 105–114.

means an act of expiation for sins committed against Johannes Philagathos or against Crescentius.[128]

In late 998 or in the first half of 999 Otto III took part in spiritual exercises in Rome.[129] The *Life of Bishop Burchard* tells us that the emperor and the brother of the protagonist, Franko, Bishop of Worms at the time, put on hair shirts, took off their shoes and in the greatest secrecy entered the vaults of the San Clemente church, and spent there two weeks, praying, fasting and holding vigils. According to the author, there are rumours that they experienced divine visions there and heard voices coming from heaven. He himself does not attach much weight to these rumours, but admits that there is a grain of truth in them. For there is no doubt that heaven revealed to the bishop the day and hour of his death.[130]

It is unclear when exactly the spiritual exercises in question were held. Mathilde Uhilrz and, after her, Jean-Marie Sansterre believe that they took place in June 999, while Stanisław Trawkowski indicates Advent of the previous year.[131] In any case, one thing is absolutely certain: they were not held during Lent, when—as we remember—Otto III went on a pilgrimage to Monte Gargano.

---

128   However, many authors of the literature on the subject disagree; see e.g. Karl-Josef Benz, "Macht und Gewissen im hohen Mittelalter. Der Beitrag des Reformsmönchtums zur Humanisierung des Herscherethos unter Otto III.," in *Consuetudines monasticae. Eine Festgabe für Kassius Hallinger*, ed. Joachim F. Angerer and Josef Lenzenweger, Studia Anselmiana 85 (Rome: Pontificio Ateneo S. Anselmo, 1982), 157–174; Sansterre, "Otton III," 392–394.

129   For more on this, see Uhlirz, *Otto III.*, 306–307; Hamilton, "The Monastery of S. Alessio," 298; Trawkowski, "Pielgrzymka Ottona III," 108; Sansterre, "Otton III," 397–399.

130   *Vita Burchardi episcopi*, ed. Georg Waitz, MGH SS, vol. 4, cap. 3, 833–834: "Eodem tempore imperator et praedictus episcopus [Franco], induti ciliciis, pedibus penitus denudatis, quandam speluncam iuxta sancti Clementis ecclesiam clam cuncti intraverunt, ibique orationibus et ieiuniis necnon in vigiliis quatuordecim dies latuerunt. Ferunt quidam visionibus et allocutionibus divinis eos crebro hoc loco fuisse consolatos. Nos autem hanc rem parum nobis compertam existimatione vulgi ruminandam relinquimus. Sed tamen hoc pro certo scimus, quod episcopo dies et hora obitus sui divinitus praenotata est" ("At the same time the emperor and the afore-mentioned bishop, dressed in hair-shirts and with completely bare feet, together and secretly entered a certain cave next to the church of Saint Clement. Over there they remained out of sight in prayer, fasting, and vigils for forty days. Some say that they were frequently consoled by visions and divine speech in this place. We ourselves, however, leave this matter to be contemplated by the judgement of the people, since we have not ourselves gained certain knowledge of it. But nevertheless we know as fact that by divine agency the day and hour of his death was made known to the bishop").

131   See fn. 129.

In this context the severity of mortification practised in the San Clemente vaults makes an even stronger impression. Being cut off from the world for two weeks, wearing hair shirts and having bare feet—these were genuine marks of humility and penance. Of course, Advent, like the days preceding the Feast of St. John the Baptist, was also a period devoted to penitential practices,[132] but they were not followed with such regularity or zeal as those during Lent.

It is worth taking note of an interpretation advocated by some historians according to whom the San Clemente "retreat" was linked to the expansion, carried out by the emperor, of the church organization in Poland and with his planned pilgrimage to Gniezno.[133] They have pointed out that the San Clemente church held the tomb of St. Constantine-Cyril, one of the Solun brothers, a fact well-known at the time. So perhaps the emperor chose the resting place of the Apostle of the Slavs as his retreat in order to entrust to him the missionary work he wanted to undertake?

There is another significant circumstance: as the quoted fragment suggests, the stay of the two young men in the San Clemente vaults had an aura of the mysterious and the miraculous about it. Although the biographer of Franko, writing some thirty years later, distanced himself from the rumours of visions and apparitions, though not entirely consistently as a matter of fact, the fact remains that such tales were being circulated in the world at the time.

In August 999 Otto III went to Subiaco. This was a place associated with the legend of St. Benedict of Nursia, which means that in this case, too, we may be dealing with a religiously motivated journey.[134] However, its context is unknown,[135] and there is no information either about any pious practices the emperor devoted himself to at the time. Otto spent the first half of the following year on his great pilgrimage to Gniezno, of which I have written in the previous chapter. Finally, we come to the year 1001. We know very well that during the Lenten season Otto III, who was in Ravenna, devoted himself to prayer and severe mortification: he denied himself food, wore a hair shirt and slept on a hard bed.[136] Peter Damian links these exercises to penance imposed

---

132   In the context of Otto III's religiousness, this circumstance is invoked by Trawkowski, "Pielgrzymka Ottona III," 109, fn. 11.

133   Hamilton, "The Monastery of S. Alessio," 298; Sansterre, "Otton III," 397–399.

134   Uhlirz, *Otto III.*, 306.

135   We can only follow Trawkowski ("Pielgrzymka Ottona III," 109, fn. 11) in conjecturing that it may have been connected with the two-week fasting observed in the Roman Church before the Feast of the Assumption of the Virgin Mary.

136   *Vita b. Romualdi*, cap. 25, 53–54: "Per totam quadragesimam in Classensi monasterio beati Apollenaris, paucis sibi adherentibus, mansit: ubi ieiunio et psalmodię, prout valebat, intentus, cilitio ad carnem indutus, aurata desuper purpura tegebatur; lecto etiam

by St. Romuald. This is an erroneous interpretation, which I have pointed out earlier. However, the severity of Otto's ascetic practices must have been great, going far beyond well-known Lenten mortification, if the idea of penance for a great sin appeared in the first place.

The material presented so far suggests interesting conclusions. First of all, it turns out that Otto III began a life full of mortification in winter 999 at the latest, and we know that at that time and earlier his position in Rome and the Empire was very strong. Thus, it is not true that the emperor's ascetic inclinations stemmed from a sense of political failure. Another striking element is the great frequency and severity of practices undertaken by the monarch. Of course, it was normal at the time for kings, just like all other Christians, to spend the Lenten season piously, prayerfully and in the spirit of mortification.[137] And yet Otto III's case is an exception to this rule for several reasons. First, that the emperor devoted himself to severe ascetic practices also in other periods throughout the year. Incontrovertible evidence can be provided by the San Clemente "retreat", though it is also worth referring to the fragment of Thietmar's chronicle quoted earlier. The fasting mentioned there cannot refer to the forty-day period preceding Easter, because everyone fasted then and the matter would not have been worthy of mention. In addition, the chronicler says that the monarch abstained from food for a week with the exception of Thursday. This automatically excludes Lent, because in this liturgical period restrictions concerning food applied equally on Thursdays and other days of the week, with the exception of Sundays, of course. Finally, worthy of note is also the great severity of the mortification, going far beyond what was canonically regarded as Lenten duty. It resembles practices applying to penitents doing public penance, such as wearing a hair shirt.[138] But no one ever imposed public penance on Otto III.

---

fulgentibus pallis strato, ipse in storia de papiris compacta tenera delicati corporis membra terebat" ("He remained throughout Lent in the monastery of Saint Apollinaris with few of his retinue with him. There he concentrated on fasting and singing psalms as much as he was able, dressed in a hair-shirt, with the gold and purple covered up. With the bed spread with shining covers, he threshed the tender limbs of his delicate body wrapped in a cloak of bark").

137   Raymund Kottje, "König Ludwig der Deutsche und die Fastenzeit," in *Mysterium der Gnade. Festschrift für Johann Auer*, ed. Heribert Rossmann and Joseph Ratzinger (Regensburg: F. Pustet, 1975), 307–311.

138   Cyrille Vogel, "Les Rites de la pénitence publique aux Xᵉ et XIᵉ siècles," in *Mélanges offerts à René Crozet*, ed. Pierre Gallais and Yves-Jean Riou (Poitiers: Société d'études médiévales, 1966), 137–144.

Obviously, the monarch was not the only person devoting himself to ascetic practices at the time. Hagiographic works as well as chronicles—as much as they deal with the lives and customs of very pious individuals—provide us with plenty of information about the subject. However, in order to understand Otto III's spirituality, we need to judge his actions in the right social context—not as compared to the forms of piety of bishops, monks or pious ladies serving God, but as compared to the ways in which other rulers experienced their faith.

If we limit our comparisons to the kings from the Liudolfingian dynasty or to other rulers in Europe at the time, we will find that Otto III's ascetic practices had no analogy.[139] A source from the 12th century—therefore, not completely reliable—does tell us that in 1004 Henry II walked barefoot in Magdeburg, in a procession from the Monastery of St. John to the cathedral.[140] But this is not an example that could be the basis for comparisons. During that procession the king was carrying the remains of St. Maurice to place them in the cathedral. Walking barefoot was, in a way, part of the ritual of the translation conducted by the ruler.[141] Of course, even then it was an expression of humility and penance. This does not mean, however, that a monarch who took off his shoes when carrying relics devoted himself to severe mortification on a daily basis. The author of *Gesta episcoporum Halberstadensium*, also writing at the turn of the 13th century, says that Otto I, hoping that Bernard, Bishop of Halberstadt, would lift a curse from him, entered the city in question wearing a hair shirt and walking barefoot.[142] Yet in this case, too, we are dealing with an event without parallel. Otto I was forced to act as he did by an anathema, while no ecclesiastical punishment was imposed on Otto III. In any case, we may ask whether we can trust such late a source as the Saxon Annalist.

Even if we did agree that both texts are reliable and that the events they describe were authentic manifestations of self-mortification, we would still conclude that Otto III definitely stood out among the Liudolfingians by virtue of his ascetic zeal. There are isolated facts associated with his ancestor and his successor, and a whole lot of facts associated with him. Walking barefoot from St. John the Baptist's to the Magdeburg cathedral was an entirely different matter from spending two weeks underground barefoot and wearing a hair shirt, in total isolation, or fasting for a whole week except for Thursday outside

---

139   Fried, *Święty Wojciech*, fn. 42 on 23.

140   See Chapter II, point 3.

141   For more on this, see Chapter II, point 3.

142   *Gesta episcoporum Halberstadensium*, ed. Ludwig Weiland, MGH SS, vol. 23 (Hanover: Hahn, 1874), 83–84. See Althoff, "Widukind von Corvey," 265–266.

the Lenten period. And we need to bear in mind that fasting in those days was much more than abstaining from meat.

As Thietmar's account quoted above tells us, Otto III was convinced that he had committed many sins in his life and he engaged in ascetic practices in order to atone for them. However, it does not seem that the emperor was guilty of some great crimes which he would want to expiate. It is true that some of his contemporaries accused him of such crimes, but we know already that either the relevant charges were groundless or he himself did not consider them to be crimes and did not intend to apologize to God for them. Thus, the ruler might have been plagued not by some specific sins but by a general sense of sinfulness.[143]

3 The King's Sinfulness in Ottonian Historiography

Our research must be expanded. A question arises as to what place was occupied by moral evil in the spirituality and ideology of the Ottonian era. I will write about spirituality in the next point of this chapter. Here I will take a look at the ideology of kingship. The analysis will be focused on historiographical sources, especially a comparison of two late Ottonian sources, namely Thietmar's *Chronicle* and Adalbold's *Life of Henry II*, with Widukind's *Chronicle*.

At one point in his work the Bishop of Merseburg[144] confronts the moral attitude of two people: Henry II and John Crescentius. He accuses the latter of duplicity in his dealing with the king, and then states:

---

143   For more on Otto III's religious practices, see recently Fauvarque, "Sylvestre II et Otto III," 584–585. NB. we may have the following doubt: was it not the case that the descriptions of Otto III's penitential practices reflected not the emperor's actual behaviour but a literary convention or expectations of the authors, who, after all, were all clergymen? (see Sarah Hamilton, ""Most illustrious king of kings". Evidence for Ottonian kingship in the Otto III prayerbook (Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 30111)," *Journal of Medieval History* 27 (2001): 259, 278). However, the problem is that the authors—very different and with very different opinions about the emperor—describe in this way only Otto III and not some other emperor. Perhaps their descriptions do reflect reality at the time.

144   For more on Thietmar's attitude to the social and political reality, see Karl Leyser, "On the Eve of the First European Revolution," in idem, *Communications and Power in Medieval Europe: The Gregorian Revolution and Beyond*, ed. Timothy Reuter, London and Rio Grande: Hambledon Press, 1994), 9–10; material for an analysis of the problem of sin in Thietmar's *Chronicle* is compiled by Dariusz Prucnal, "Władca chrześcijański w Kronice Thietmara biskupa merseburskiego," *Roczniki Humanistyczne* 44 (1996), no. 2, 5–36, especially 6–13; on providentialism in Thietmar's work, see Lutz E. von Padberg, "Geschichtsschreibung

Although our king was only a man, he was filled with zeal for God and used his strong arm to punish those who attacked and pillaged holy churches. Such a beneficent character could only have been granted to him by heaven. That patrician [that is, Crescentius], in contrast, was worldly both in character and in deed. Into his filthy maw, as if so much plunder, he gathered the offerings that so many devout hands had heaped upon the altar of the Apostles for the sake of their sins.[145]

The chronicler expresses his profound pessimism with regard to human nature. He is inclined to believe that when left to their own devices, human beings do not love God and, consequently, oppress the Church. Only someone graced by heaven can get out of the clutches of evil. Henry II is exactly such a man. On the other hand, Crescentius, deprived of the assistance of the heavenly forces, pillaged the property belonging to the patrons of Rome.

On many occasions the Bishop of Merseburg states that Henry was made ruler by God himself.[146] Thus, it will not be a mistake to say that the monarch's morally privileged position stemmed from his having been chosen to be king. When putting him on the throne, heaven instilled in Henry the grace of virtue so that he would sincerely want to constantly care for the Church, that is, in other words—would appropriately fulfil the duties to the performance of which he had been called. The way of thinking we have the right to attribute to the chronicler was quite common in the analyzed period. Let me give one example. Several years after Thietmar's death, Matilda, daughter of Herman, Duke of Swabia, in her letter to Mieszko II presented the following view: the ruler in question is a king crowned by God himself and we know this because he has built many churches and cares for the holy liturgy as no one else. At the same time Matilda says that when making Mieszko II king, heaven taught him the art of reigning. There is no doubt that the author of the letter based her

---

und kulturelles Gedächtnis. Formen der Vergangenheitswahrnehmung in der hochmittel-alterlichen Historiographie am Beispiel von Thietmar, Adam von Bremen und Helmold von Bosau," *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 105 (1994): 156–177; on the theology of royal power professed by the chronicler, see Körntgen, *Königsherrschaft*, 121–136.

145   English translation by Warner, *Ottonian Germany*, 357.—"Rex etenim noster, quamvis homo esset, zelum Dei habuit et sanctarum violentas predaciones aecclesiarum fortis armatus vendicavit hancque benignitatem nisi caelitus sibi prestitam non habuit; iste terrenus et natura et actibus voragine cenulenta traxit in predam, quod multorum devota manus ad aram apostolorum pro peccatis congessit in hostiam" (Thietmar, lib. VII, cap. 71, 486).

146   E.g. in the sentence preceding the quote from the previous footnote; see also lib. V, cap. 2, 222; lib. VI, cap. 6, 280; VII, prologus, 396.

reasoning on the following premise: whenever God makes someone king, he endows him with various virtues needed in this vocation; among these many virtues is love for the Church.[147]

Matilda's letter is a eulogy crowned with a thoroughly political thesis, which is why the problem of sin of one anointed by God did not suggest itself to her. Thietmar was in a different situation. He was writing a chronicle and not a panegyric, and although he identified himself with the interests of Saxony and Merseburg, and was very friendly towards the Liudolfingians, he did not intend to turn a historiographical work into a political manifesto. The concept of the work made it possible for the problem of the king's sin to find itself within the author's field of vision. Indeed, the author took up the issue and was even rather emphatic about it.[148] Let us browse the chronicle from this point of view.

Thietmar's opinion of Henry I's reign is positive and his view is based on two premises. First of all, says the chronicler, the king founded Merseburg. The chronicler does mention the fact that the city originated in the Roman times and he readily believes that, but on the other hand, he is in no doubt that it was founded for the second time by Henry, as it were. The monarch regulated ownership issues in Merseburg, reinforced its walls and founded the Church of St. John the Baptist, which later became a cathedral. Thus, he laid the foundations for the city's future greatness.[149] In the chronicler's eyes the matter was important not only because as the Bishop of Merseburg he felt emotionally bound to his diocesan see, but also because of the importance which the foundation of the bishopric had in his view in the history of the kingdom: it was thanks to the foundation that Otto I defeated the Hungarians at Lechfeld (strictly speaking, thanks to his vow that he would make such a foundation) and it was thanks to it that the kingdom enjoyed power and glory in Thietmar's times.[150]

But there was another reason why the chronicler's assessment of Henry I's rule was positive. As an outstanding knight, the monarch subordinated many

---

147   The latest edition of the letter: *Kodeks Matyldy. Księga obrzędów z kartami dedykacyjnymi*, ed. Brygida Kürbis et al., Polska Akademia Umiejętności, Monumenta Sacra Polonorum 1 (Kraków: Polska Akademia Umiejętności, 2000), 139–140. I have presented an interpretation of this source in Michałowski, *Princeps fundator*, 53–71; see also my review of *Kodeks Matyldy* in *Studia Źródłoznawcze* 40 (2002): 225–228.

148   The problem of sin in Thietmar's work—the king's sinfulness and human sinfulness in general—is examined by Körntgen, *Königsherrschaft*, 127–136.

149   E.g. Thietmar, lib. I, cap. 28, 34–36. See Helmut Lippelt, *Thietmar von Merseburg, Reichsbischof und Chronist*, Mitteldeutsche Forschungen 72 (Cologne and Vienna, 1973), 142–143.

150   Michałowski, *Princeps fundator*, 18–20.

Slavic tribes to his rule, defeated the Hungarians, incorporated Lorraine into his kingdom, beat the Danes and the Normans, contributed to the Christianization of Denmark and put the imperial crown on his head. This does not mean, however, that Thietmar wrote a panegyric praising the ruler. On the contrary, he meticulously records the monarch's sins. He vividly describes his love affairs, mentions his wartime robberies and thinks that Henry's snubbing of royal anointment was a sin. At the end he raises a very embarrassing matter: much to Satan's joy, the drunk monarch had intercourse with his wife on the night preceding Good Friday, which had very painful consequences for the entire kingdom.[151]

In the relevant fragments of his work the author uses the chronicle written by Widukind, who either does not mention the facts in question or does not express a negative opinion about them. In this case we can even speak of Thietmar's eagerness to trace his protagonist's sins.

The Bishop of Merseburg attributes the king's political successes to God's grace, which was always with the monarch. At one point he states this explicitly.[152] A question arises, however, as to how the chronicler reconciles the conviction that his protagonist's enjoyed heavenly favour with the view that he was a sinner. It seems that an answer is provided by the fragment in which the author describes the last events from King Henry I's life:

> The king repeatedly expelled the invading Hungarians. But one day, when the king tried to attack them with insufficient forces, he was defeated and fled to a burg called Piichen [Püchen]. Because he escaped the danger of death there, he honoured the occupants with glory greater than they had hitherto held and their neighbour hold today, and bestowed upon them worthy gifts.
>
> Throughout his life, as often as [Henry] raised himself up in pride against God and his Lord, with his power humbled, he would submit to a worthy penance. I have heard that when he went to Rome for the sake of prayer, he travelled more on foot than by horse. When many asked why he

---

151   See below fn. 155 and the text referring to the footnote.

152   "Qualiter misericors Deus predictum regem [sc. Heinricum] in diebus suis respexerit [...], cunctis tamen fidelibus innotescam", and goes on to describe how the king obtained the hand of St. Denis and power over entire Lorraine with it (Thietmar, lib. I, cap. 23, 30). English translation by Warner, *Ottonian Germany*, 84: "[...] I shall nonetheless reveal to all the faithfull how [...] the king benefited from the mercy of God."

did this, he revealed his guilt. In the year 931 of the Incarnation he was made emperor.[153]

The chronicler is, of course, wrong, when he claims that Henry I went to Rome and crowned himself emperor.[154] However, this is of no great significance when it comes to interpreting the quoted fragment. Something else matters: this brief excerpt reflects the author's opinion about the importance of sin, penance and grace in public life. The ruler in question was a sinful and vainglorious man. His pride led to political and military defeats. However, each failure on the battle-field or, more generally, in the public sphere, prompted the king to repent and atone appropriately. That is why the monarch kept regaining God's grace, which enabled him to triumph again. The chronicler illustrates his "theory" with spe-cific facts. The king's pride caused his defeat in the war against the Hungarians. On the other hand, his penitential pilgrimage to the Eternal City not only atoned for his sins, but also brought him the imperial crown.

As we can see, the tension between the prerequisite for political success, that is, the favour of heaven, and the ruler's sinful nature is relieved by Thietmar by a reference to the concept of penance. Was it always sufficient? Highly meaningful in this respect is the above mentioned anecdote about Henry's intercourse with Matilda on the night before Good Friday.[155] The author tells us that as a result of this intercourse Matilda gave birth to Henry, the progenitor of the Bavarian branch of the Liudolfingians. In addition, he gives us an opinion that was expressed at the time. People say that because Satan

---

153   English translation by Warner, *Ottonian Germany*, 79.—"Rex autem Avares sepenumero insurgentes expulit. Et cum in uno dierum hos inpari congressu ledere temptaret, victus in urbem, quae Bichni vocatur, fugit; ibique mortis periculum evadens, urbanos maiori gloria, quam hactenus haberent vel comprovinciales hodie teneant, et ad haec muneri-bus dignis honorat. / Quociecumque contra Deum et seniorem suimet, dum vixit, se umquam superbiendo erexit, tocies humiliata potestate sua se ad emendationem con-dignam inclinavit. Audivi, quod hic, Romam causam orationis petens, plus pedibus quam equo laboraret, et a multis interrogatus, cur sic ageret, culpam profiteretur. Anno dominicae incarnationis DCCCCXXXI° imperator effectus est" (Thietmar, lib. I, cap. 15, 20–22). See an important comment by Lothar Bornscheuer, *Miseriae regum. Untersuchungen zum Krisen- und Todesgedanken in den herrschaftstheologischen Vorstellungen der otto-nisch-salischen Zeit*, Arbeiten zur Frühmittelalterforschung 4 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1968), 112–114; also Lippelt, *Thietmar*, 147, fn. 27, in which he attacks the comment (unjustly, in my opinion).

154   For more on this, see Lippelt, *Thietmar*, 147–148.

155   Thietmar, lib. I, cap. 24, 30–32.

had a hand in this sin, the son and, consequently, all his progeny provoked discord. Thietmar distances himself slightly from this opinion, but does not reject it altogether.

The greatest hero in the chronicler's eyes in Otto I. The bishop calls him the "glory of the kingdom" and considers him to have been the greatest ruler since Charlemagne.[156] His view is that during Otto's reign the world experienced its Golden Age. When the emperor died, the Golden Age turned into the Bronze Age. Among the monarch's achievements, the chronicler lists the foundation of six bishoprics, victory over the haughty Berengar, the conquest of Italy, the imperial crown, the subordination of the coastline peoples, the subjugation of the Danes and the western neighbours, and, finally, the establishment of peace.[157] Otto I would not have achieved such success if it had not been for Divine aid, which he always sought.[158] Thanks to this Divine protection, he was able to defeat all the rebels that stood in his way. Divine inspiration was also the source of all his important decisions. The chronicler does not introduce a counterpoint here: political success on the one hand—sin on the other. This does not mean that Otto was free of guilt. The author writes reproachfully about the deposition of Pope Benedict V and about Divine punishment for this: almost the entire imperial army was killed by pestilence.[159] In addition, he mentions—though without going into details—innumerable misdeeds which the king could not avoid among all the tasks and affairs waiting for him.[160] However, everything that Thietmar writes about sin is lost in the shower of praise and admiration.

Yet, there is a fragment in the chronicle in which the author writes about the ruler's penance, attaching a lot of weight to it. The fragment in question is devoted to the Battle of Lechfeld. First, Thietmar informs us that the Hungarians outnumbered their opponents and that they had their first successes in the battle; then he adds the following:

---

156   Thietmar, lib. II, cap. 45, 92–94.

157   See e.g. Thietmar, lib. II, prologus, 36–38. For more on Thietmar's description of the figure of Otto I, see Lippelt, *Thietmar*, 149–156.

158   Thietmar, lib. II, prologus, 36, cap. 3, 40, cap. 23, 66, cap. 27, 72.

159   Thietmar, lib. II, cap. 28, 72–74 and cap. 35, 82; see Pius Engelbert OSB stressing the chronicler's great respect for the Holy See ("Das Papsttum in der Chronik Thietmars von Merseburg," *Römische Quartalschrift für christliche Altertumskunde und Kirchengeschichte* 97(2002): 89–122; on the fragment in question, 91–93).

160   Thietmar, lib. II, cap. 45, 94.

> The next day, that is on the feast of the martyr of Christ, Lawrence, the king alone prostrated himself before the others and confessed his sins to God, tearfully swearing the following oath: if on that day, through the intercession of such a great advocate, Christ would deign to grant him victory and life he would establish a bishopric in the city of Merseburg in honour of the victor over the fire and turn his newly begun palace there into a church. After raising himself from the ground and after his confessor, Ulrich, had celebrated the mass and holy communion, the king took up his shield and the holy lance and led his warriors against the enemy forces, annihilating and pursuing them till evening when they fled.[161]

The chronicler attributes the victory of the German king to several religious factors, including the vow made to St. Lawrence[162] and the use of the holy lance in the battle. In our context of particular significance is the monarch's *confiteor*. He went into battle aware of his sinfulness, so before lunging at his enemy, he made a sign of humility to God and confessed his sins to Him. At the same time, the author brings in Ulrich (Udalric), saying that he was Otto I's confessor. When Thietmar was writing his work, the Bishop of Augsburg had already been canonized,[163] and the reigning monarch at the time, that is, Henry II, regarded him as his patron.[164] By introducing the figure of the holy confessor into the description, the author further emphasizes the role played by the monarch's *confiteor* and taking away of his sins stemming from it. As in many other fragments, here, too, the Bishop of Merseburg drew on Widukind's

---

161 English translation by Warner, *Ottonian Germany*, 98.—"Postera die, id est in festivitate Christi martyris Laurentii, rex, solum se prae caeteris culpabilem Deo professus atque prostratus, hoc fecit lacrimis votum profusis: si Christus dignaretur sibi eo die tanti intercessione preconis dare victoriam et vitam, ut in civitate Merseburgensi episcopatum in honore victoris ignium construere domumque suimet magnam noviter inceptam sibi ad aecclesiam vellet edificare. Nec mora, erectus a terra, post missae celebrationem sacramque communionem ab egregio porrectam Othelrico confessore suo, sumpsit rex clipeum lancea cum sacra, milites in hostem precedendo resistemque primus inrupit ac mox terga vertentem usque ad vesperam prostravit ac effugavit" (Thietmar, lib. II, cap. 10, 48).

162 Michałowski, *Princeps fundator*, 18–20.

163 Ernst-Dieter Hehl, "Lucia/Lucina—Die Echtheit von JL 3848. Zu den Anfängen der Heiligenverehrung Ulrichs von Augsburg," *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters* 51 (1995) 191–211.

164 Zob. Karl Hauck, „Erzbischof Adalbert von Magdeburg als Geschichtsschreiber", in *Festschrift für Walter Schlesinger*, 308–310.

chronicle, where he found an extensive account of the Battle of Lechfeld.[165]
Yet there is no mention of Otto I's confession there.

In this context it is worth taking a look at another chapter of Thietmar's
work. Commenting on the invasions of the pagans, the Bishop of Merseburg
wonders where the barbarians find so much courage to set out on military
expeditions to such remote and populous a country as Germany. His answer
is as follows:

> With divine consent, they were aroused as God's vengeance for our sins
> and we fled like cowards, terror-stricken because of our injustice. So it
> happened that we, who rejected the fear of the lord in prosperous times,
> rightly endured the lash of the lord. Having made no attempt to pla-
> cate the anger of heaven, we were not heard when we cried out to God.
> Germany, standing firm as a wall against their arrows, suffered more from
> these invaders than its neighbours.[166]

In this fragment, too, we have the problem of sin and penance. According to
Thietmar, the Hungarian invasions and, on the other hand, the Germans' weak
resistance were caused by a lack of fear of God, the source of evil deeds. Of
course, penance would have been a remedy in this case as well, but the people
of Germany did not want to use it. At the same time, the excerpt quoted above
allows us to look at the problem from a broader perspective. Firstly, the author
indicates the reason of his compatriots' iniquity. That reason is pride, provoked
by prosperity and success. Moreover, it turns out that sins bringing disaster to
the country are committed not by the king or not only by the king, but by the
entire body politic.

And yet the Hungarian invasions eventually ended in the German victory at
the Battle of Lechfeld. As we already know, the triumph over the enemy was
possible thanks to the monarch's confession of his own sins. Does this mean
that the chronicler believed that there was some connection between the sins
of the king and sins of his people? We should take our time in answering this
question. After all, Thietmar did not try to present a systematic analysis of

---

165   See fn. 190.

166   English translation by Warner, *Ottonian Germany*, 97—"[…] consensu divino hii facinori-
       bus nostris accenduntur in vindictam Dei nosque admodum territi fugimus ignavi iniusti-
       tia nostri, fitque tunc, ut, qui in prosperis sprevimus timore Dei, merito sustineamus
       flagellum Domini, ac invocantes Deum non exaudimur, qui offensam placare supernam
       nullo modo conabamur" (Thietmar, lib. II, cap. 7, 46).

the problem in question and he may have been putting to parchment chaotic thoughts, not realizing they did not always make up a coherent whole.

However, if there was such a connection, we will find traces of it also when we follow the way in which the Bishop of Merseburg presents the reign of Otto II. The chronicler divides the history of his rule into two periods: the first filled with peace and prosperity, the second—with defeats in war.[167] Thietmar is convinced that the disaster of the last few years of Otto II's reign was caused by the abolition of the Diocese of Merseburg.[168] Its circumstances are discussed by the author in relative detail, with the responsibility for the deed being placed primarily on Bishop Gisiler and members of the Roman synod. It is obvious that without the emperor's consent the diocese would not have been abolished and the chronicler does admit that, though he tries not to emphasize the monarch's guilt. On the other hand, he sees the cause of war defeats towards the end of Otto II's rule in "our" sins, that is, the sins of society at large.[169] The question returns once again: whose sins brought disaster to the country—the king's or the people's?

Thietmar has a high opinion of Henry II's reign. The monarch, established by God and aided by God, defeated the rebels in Germany and Italy, obtained the imperial crown, revived the Bishopric of Merseburg, and, first of all, restored internal peace to the country: the conflicts between the two branches of the Liudolfingians, tearing the country apart since Otto I's times, found their resolution in Henry II.[170] The reign of this ruler would not have been so successful, if it had not been for God's grace that shaped his sense of morality. As a result, the monarch not only did not persecute churches, but also severely punished those who did. I have mentioned this earlier.[171]

However, this does not mean that Henry was without sin. From time to time the chronicler mentions the king's guilt, even admitting that it brought unpleasant consequences for the country.[172] Significantly, however, in such cases the Bishop of Merseburg does not want to dramatize. We are dealing with suggestions rather than with a description of sins and their political consequences. On the other hand, the bishop stresses the monarch's humility:

---

167   Thietmar, lib. III, prologus, 94–96.

168   Michałowski, *Princeps fundator*, 18–20.

169   Thietmar, lib. III, prologus, 94–96.

170   Thietmar, lib. I, cap. 24, 32.

171   See fn. 145.

172   E.g. Thietmar, lib. V, cap. 31, 255.

the king not only confessed his sinfulness, making it responsible for the disasters affecting the kingdom, but he also eagerly did penance for his misdeeds.[173]

Interestingly, the author sees a sinner even in Henry II, although he does not deny him God's grace and regards his reign as very prosperous for the country. We cannot help thinking that the moral weakness of rulers—both Henry II and his predecessors—was a problem that deeply bothered Thietmar. He was convinced that in order to understand history, this factor had to be taken into account, and this applied equally to the other factor, that is, penance.

Thietmar's *Chronicle* was used by the Bishop of Utrecht, Adabold, when he wrote his *Life of Henry* II when his protagonist was still alive.[174] Commissioned by the king's court, he must have had less freedom than his predecessor in raising politically sensitive issues. Thus, we should not be surprised that he was not too eager to write about the emperor's moral weaknesses. Yet the issue of the monarch's sinfulness does appear in the *Vita*. This happens in a rather surprising way.

Describing the events of January 1003, Thietmar mentions that at that time Henry II twice fell ill: for the first time during his journey to Aachen, when an illness from which the monarch had suffered since his birth recurred, and then shortly after that in Liège.[175] This thread is taken up by Adalbold, who develops it in quite an unexpected direction. He comments on the attack of illness during the journey to Aachen as follows: it was a warning for the ruler that, although he was a king, he was nevertheless still a man.[176] The biographer also provides an unusual interpretation of the suffering that struck Henry in Liège. It is no less than a paternal reprimand from God for the ruler, who,

---

173   Thietmar, lib. V, prologus, 220; lib. V, cap. 31, 255.

174   *Vita Heinrici II. imperatoris*, 679–695. For more on this work, see Bornscheuer, *Miseriae regum*, 122–140; Lippelt, *Thietmar von Merseburg*, 184 with fn. 33 and 191–192.

175   Thietmar, lib. V, cap. 28, 253.

176   *Vita Heinrici II. imperatoris*, cap. 20, 689: "Colloquio potenter habito, Aquisgrani ire decrevit [sc. Heinricus], ut ibi anniversarium imperatoris debita devotione recoleret, et Lotharienses ad se confluentes ad fidelitatem sui et ad utlitatem regni corroboraret. Interim infirmitate gravissima tangitur, et rex cum sit, homo esse monetur. Iter tamen coeptum finivit, et Aquas usque pervenit" ("After the conclusion of the conclave, he commanded that they should go to Aachen in order that the anniversary of the emperor should be celebrated with appropriate devotion, and so that the Lotharingians, coming to him, should confirm their allegiance to him and their service to the kingdom. In the meanwhile, he is struck by grave illness, for although he be king, he is admonished that he is a man. Nevertheless, he completed the journey begun, and reached Aachen").

giving in to his human weakness, becomes proud on account of the power he enjoys.[177]

As we can see, Adalbold believed that by the very fact of being a king, the monarch was exposed to the danger of moral evil. Aware of his great power, the king—a sinful man by nature—becomes proud and with this he insults God. There emerge some analogies between Adalbold's reasoning and Thietmar's views. As we remember, the Bishop of Merseburg claimed, referring to Henry I, that success made the king excessively proud and that, consequently, he suffered defeats in battle as a punishment for this sin. Only penance in each case averted Divine wrath and ensured political success anew. The other author, too, saw a risk of sin in the ruler's prosperity and power, but he hoped that this danger, or at least its consequences, could be prevented by the work of heaven. Henry II did not have to wait for political disasters to come to his senses, nor did he have to impose penance on himself to expiate his guilt. The Lord himself, by afflicting him with disease, reminded him of some basic truths and set the penance. It could be said that heaven itself made sure that the anointed one would avoid sin and would not expose himself to the risk of military defeat.

But the analogy lies elsewhere as well. Both authors were pessimistic about human nature.[178] Man left to his own devices is exposed to the temptation of sin, which he cannot resist. According to Thietmar, God instilled virtue in Henry II and thus rescued him from the human state. Adalbold thought along similar lines: suffering sent from heaven made the kind refrain from going in the direction dictated to him by human weakness.

The available material warrants the following conclusion: both writers regarded the king's sin and his penance as issues important to the understanding of history and politics. A question that must be asked is: was this principle followed only by late Ottonian authors or, on the contrary—was it characteristic of writers in the Saxon period in general? Let us try to find an answer by analyzing the chronicle of Widukind, an author writing half a century before Thietmar.[179]

---

177   *Vita Heinrici II. imperatoris*, cap. 21, 689: "Ibi [sc. Leodii] colicam infirmitatem ab antecessoribus suis sibi ingenitam gravissime patitur; et qui per regalem potentiam usu humanae fragilitatis extollitur, per corporalem molestiam paterna castigatione reprimitur" ("At Liège he suffers terribly from colic, the sickness inherited from his ancestors. He, raised up from the wearing away of human fragility by royal power, is curbed by the physical ailment as a form of paternal chastisement").

178   With regard to Adalbold, see the quote in the previous footnote.

179   The circumstances in which the chronicle was written have recently been discussed by Althoff, "Widukind von Corvey," 253–272.

The Corvey monk presented a coherent vision of the history of Saxony and its dynasty to which he himself was related. In his work he consistently defends the following view. The Saxons conquered the land in which they live and then became the rulers of the Frankish Empire and achieved hegemony in Europe, because such was the will of heaven. In more recent times they owed their triumphs to rulers from the House of Liudolfing, to whom God entrusted power over their homeland and whom he constantly supported.[180]

This concept is reflected in many fragments of the *Chronicle* and in its structure as a whole. Let us look at several excerpts of Book 1. First, let us refer to a scene which has become famous and on which scholars often like to comment. King Conrad, mortally wounded in battle and broken by political failures, wishes that he would be succeeded not by his brother but by his rival, Henry of Saxony. We, Franks, he says, have everything a kingdom needs: army, weapons, fortified towns, royal insignia. We lack just one thing: good fortune and good mores (*fortuna atque mores*). Good fortune is on Henry's side and Henry can boast the best mores as well. The brother complied with Conrad's wish and the Saxon prince became the new king.[181] As we can see, when trying to answer the question why the Saxons came to power in the kingdom of the Franks, the chronicler refers to fate, that is, to a religious category. Of course, we may wonder whether this notion is in accordance with Christian ideas, but the fact that Widukind uses hermeneutics referring to the sacred is beyond any doubt.

Other examples are completely unequivocal. As the author tells us, the relics of St. Vitus, brought to Corvey in Louis the Pious's times, made the power of the Saxons increase, while the power of the Franks began to diminish. As a result, Otto I became lord of not only Germany, Italy and Gaul, but also the

---

180   Widukind's concept has been studied from many angles by a number of scholars stressing different aspects of the problem; see e.g. Helmut Beumann, *Widukind von Korvei. Untersuchungen zur Geschichtsschreibung und Ideengeschichte des 10. Jahrhunderts*, Abhandlungen über Corveyer Geschichtsschreibung 3 (Weimar Böhlaus Nachf., 1950), especially 205–265 (with a strong emphasis on not just the Christian but also the pagan *sacrum*); Hagen Keller, "Machabeorum pugnae. Zum Stellenwert eines biblischen Vorbilds in Widukinds Deutung der ottonischen Königsherrschaft," in *Iconologia sacra*, 417–437; idem, "Widukinds Bericht über die Aachener Wahl und Krönung Ottos 1.," *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 29 (1995): 390–453, especially 445, 452; Körntgen, *Königsherrschaft*, 74–101. An interpretation of the king's defeat, illness and death can be found in Bornscheuer, *Miseriae regum*, 16–41.

181   Widukind, lib. 1, cap. 25, 56. The most important literature on the subject discussing this scene is listed by Althoff, "Widukind von Corvey," 253–254.

whole Europe.[182] The chronicler returns to this idea when he writes about Henry I's death. He notes that Henry left his son a great empire he had received from God.[183]

Yet thinking in terms of the sacred not only left its mark on various fragments of the work—it imbues the whole of it, in fact. In order to see that this is indeed the case, let us analyze the structure of Books II and III, which deal with the reign of Otto I. In the analysis we shall leave aside the fragments added by the authors after the death of the great emperor.

Book II begins with a majestic description of the coronation in Aachen. Widukind takes this opportunity to emphasize that Otto I is a king chosen by God.[184] Then he writes about two external wars: against Boleslav of Bohemia and against the Hungarians. Both ended in German victories, but in the first case the Germans were able to succeed only because the king personally took part in the fighting and the king—as the chronicler notes—was filled with God's power.[185] Nearly the whole of the remaining part of Book II is filled with a description of rebellions of magnates against the ruler. Each of the rebellions was suppressed. But this was not easy and Widukind stresses several times the great danger to which the king's political position and he himself were exposed. One of such crises was created by the betrayal of Eberhard of Franconia, who in 939 joined Giselbert of Lorraine, the king's brother-in-law, in an uprising. When the news of the betrayal reached the ruler, many abandoned him and he was left with just a handful of knights. "And there was no longer hope—comments the chronicler—that the Saxons would continue to reign".[186] On another occasion, as a result of a conspiracy of the king's brother Henry, the very life of the monarch was in danger. The horror of the situation is further compounded by a description of extraordinary signs that appeared that year—the same signs that had preceded the death of Henry I. Otto saved his life thanks to the fact that God protected him all the time.[187] It was God who rescued the king out of all the troubles described in the book. He helped him quash Giselbert's and Eberhard's revolt,[188] and He enabled the king to defeat Henry at the Battle of Birten despite his strategically hopeless position.[189]

---

182   Widukind, lib. I, cap. 33–34, 64–68.

183   Widukind, lib. I, cap. 41, 78.

184   Widukind, lib. II, cap. 1, 84–88.

185   Widukind, lib. II, cap. 3–4, 92–94.

186   Widukind, lib. II, cap. 24, 110: "[…] nec ultra spes erat regnandi Saxones".

187   Widukind, lib. II, cap. 31, 114.

188   Widukind, lib. II, cap. 26, 110.

189   Widukind, lib. II, cap. 17, 102–104.

In the final fragments of the book Widukind describes the situation in the country after the suppression of rebellions of German aristocrats. All kingdoms accepted Otto's hegemony, wars among them ended, there was peace between the king and his brother and the country flourished.

At the beginning of Book III the author talks a lot about the monarch's victories over external enemies: in France over Hugh the Great and the Normans, in Bohemia over Boleslav, in Italy over Berengar II. The subject of many subsequent chapters is the rebellion of Prince Liudolf against his father. In a masterful way the chronicler shows the growing danger threatening Otto's reign. Otto was abandoned by secular and church magnates one by one, with only a handful of people remaining with the rightful ruler. Despite that, Liudolf's uprising failed.

Widukind tackles another issue, a new challenge the monarch had to face, namely a Hungarian invasion. The description of the Battle of Lechfeld, a turning point in the war, is divided into two parts in the chronicle.[190] In the first, the author lists the defeats initially suffered by the German forces. This is followed by a chapter dealing with the Saxons' defeat in a simultaneous war against the Slavs. Only then the author describes the second, decisive stage of the campaign against the Hungarians in which they were crushed. We are dealing here with a well-thought-out composition. The chapter devoted to the ill-fated war against the Slavs, the narrative of which breaks the description of the Battle of Lechfeld, is to enhance the impression of danger hanging over the kingdom—impression left by the first stage of the battle. A similar objective is to be achieved by the fragment, placed in the same context, which mentions the ominous signs appearing at the time. With this structure Widukind wanted to show, it seems, that the victory over the Hungarians was achieved only thanks to God's intervention; and that God granted his help only on Otto's account. Indeed, a turning point in the military operations came when the king personally attacked the enemy holding the holy lance in his hand.

In the final fragments of Book III (let us not forget that we are analyzing the chronicle in its original form) the author talks about Wichmann's rebellion and fights against the Slavs. The conflicts ended well for Otto. These and other victories of the Saxon monarch enhanced his authority among the European nations. The book and the chronicle end with Wichmann's death. This is the finale of a case that began many years earlier. That is why thematically the last problem raised by Widukind is the emperor's Italian policy. The author sums up his great political successes in this field.

---

190   Widukind, lib. III, cap. 44–49, 152–158. See Keller, "Machabeorum pugnae," passim.

The books under consideration here have a similar structure. First, we have triumphal elements: easy victories over an external enemy, and, in addition, coronation ceremonies in the second book. The theme of prosperity and triumph returns at the end of each book. In the second book the author speaks of Otto's hegemony being acknowledged by various kingdoms, and of the peace that reigned at the time; in the third—about the imperial dictate in Italy and expansion of the empire. The middle part of the narrative, indeed, a vast majority of the text, is filled with a description of successive crises caused by civil wars and external wars—crises that were so serious that they threatened Otto I's reign or the integrity and independence of the realm.

The structure seems to be reflecting a more profound idea. When explaining the king's defeats in the war against Liudolf, Widukind says: "All this, as we believe, was caused by God in order for the one whom he put in charge of many nations and tribes to understand that he himself could do nothing, but with God—he could do everything".[191] Thus, it turns out that the crises that again and again hit the monarch's reign are a kind of hierophany. They testify to the fact that God and only God is the foundation of Otto's power. The king's riches, his army and numerous vassals mean nothing, if despite all his might the monarch is defeated again and again. Then, when his might is broken, he wins. It seems that the composition of the books is to make this great truth evident. They begin with triumphal elements in order to show the great force Otto had at his disposal. This is followed by a series of crises from which he is saved by God. The riches and the army are of no use to him. Finally, he triumphs again. The aim of this structural device is to show more emphatically the Lord's great grace for his chosen one.

From one point of view Widukind's hermeneutics resembles the way of thinking we can notice in Thietmar's case. The Corvey monk, like the Bishop of Merseburg, liked to refer to the working of Divine power when interpreting history. We could even say without hesitation that the former did it even more emphatically than the latter. On the other hand, what makes the two undoubtedly different is the fact that Widukind completely ignored the other factor playing a significant part in Thietmar's thinking, namely sin. Indeed, the misdeeds committed by the Saxon rulers are not mentioned by the Corvey chronicler at all, even in the context of the Battle of Lechfeld.

This is highly significant given the huge role played in Widukind's vision by descriptions of the defeats of the chronicle's main protagonist. It might seem

---

191   Widukind, lib. III, cap. 20, 142: "Haec omnia a Deo credimus acta, ut qui serenissimum regem plurimis populis ac gentibus preficere voluit, discere parum in se, in Deo vero omnia posse". See Körntgen, *Königsherrschaft*, 99–100.

that in this case there would be no escaping a reference to sin. Of course, the author saw the defeats and failures as having been caused by Divine retribution, regarding them as a kind of "pedagogical" move. This brings to mind the line of reasoning followed by Adalbold, who also referred to Divine "pedagogy". However, Henry ɪɪ's biographer admitted, though without putting much emphasis on it, that political power and prosperity had made the emperor proud. Widukind did not go as far as that.

Yet a question arises: are we not looking for something in Widukind's chronicle that could not be included in it, because the author dedicated the work to the emperor's daughter? Could he have written in these circumstances about the monarch's weaknesses, even if he had thought them responsible for his military and political defeats? Answers to these questions are provided by Adalbold's work. As we know, the author was writing for the court and yet he did not hesitate to raise the problem of the king's sinfulness. This could also have been the case with Widukind. Had the historiographer saw the monarch's moral decline as an important factor influencing the course of events, he would have had to touch upon this aspect of reality in one way or another. And he would have easily found a way to do so without wounding the ego of the reigning king. It is easy to image, for example, Widukind—like Thietmar two generations after him—mentioning Otto ɪ's confession before the Battle of Lechfeld. This would have brought no discredit on the hero, because, as we know, every Catholic, even the most pious one, goes to confession.

The problem of the king's sinfulness as seen by the Ottonian historiography, would deserve a more detailed analysis based on the entire writing legacy. I will not undertake this task in the present book. However, my suggestion is that the three selected historical works, very eminent works after all, should be regarded as representative of chronicle writing of the period. The works analyzed here lead us to the conclusion that the sinfulness of rulers became a problem only in the eyes of late Ottonian authors. Not only did they notice the moral evil to which monarchs were susceptible, but they were also worried by negative consequences a king's moral decline could have for the political prosperity of his nation. This concern is not apparent in Widukind writing two generations earlier. What is more, Widukind did not even ask himself whether and to what extent the Saxon kings were susceptible to moral evil.

Otto ɪɪɪ was a contemporary of Thietmar and not Widukind. This is why if we want to understand the emperor's actions, we need to examine them in the light of the Bishop of Merseburg's worldview. We know that the monarch lived with a constant sense of guilt, that he constantly examined his conscience and that his life was full of penance and mortification. Undoubtedly, this was dictated by his concern about eternal salvation. Yet bearing in mind Thietmar's

historiosophy, we can suspect that there was another reason at play here: Otto's concern for the success of his reign and prosperity of the Empire which he guided.

In any case, there are grounds to claim that the emperor was deeply affected by his political defeats and that at some point this caused a serious crisis of consciousness for him. It happened in the early spring of 1001, when the monarch publicly declared that he intended to abdicate and enter a monastery. At that time he was in Ravenna, away from Rome, from which he had been driven out. An obvious question arises as to whether the source information concerning Otto III's monastic vocation is fully reliable. Scholars have been debating about this problem in the literature on the subject for over one-hundred years, without reaching an unequivocal conclusion. That is why we have to form our own opinion on the matter.

We have at our disposal two accounts which mention the event in question. The first is included in Bruno of Querfurt's *Life of the Five Brethren*, while the second is to be found in Peter Damian's *Life of St. Romuald*.

Bruno of Querfurt writes as follows:

> Erat autem sponsio regis, ut que non amans sine fructu possedit, pro desiderio Ihesu Christi regno et diuiciits sponte careret, et quia aduersa que ad salutem dirigere solent homines instabant, coram certis testibus in conspectu Dei et angelorum mentem quam dudum habuit, uerbis patefecit, ut in ore duorum et trium testium stet omne uerbum: Ex hac hora promitto Deo et sanctis eius: post tres annos intra quo imperii mei errata corrigam, meliori meo regnum dimittam, et expensa pecunia quam mihi mater pro hereditate reliquit, tota anima nudus sequar Christum.[192]

In addition to clearly and unequivocally stating that the emperor intended to enter a monastery, the fragment gives us the motives behind his decision. Of course, his love for Christ did play a part—a crucial part, no doubt—but in the

---

192   *Vita Quinque Fratrum*, cap. 2, 34 ("Indeed, the king promised that he would spontaneously go without kingdom and riches, out of desire for Christ, as things unfruitfully possessed without love. And since adversity, which tends to direct men towards salvation, threatened, he declared in words what he had recently had in his mind before faithful witnesses and in the sight of God and the angels, so that it should always be present in the mouth of two or three witnesses: In this hour I promise God and his saints the following: after three years, in which I shall correct the errors of my rule, I shall hand over my kingdom to one better than me, and having spent the riches that my mother left me as my inheritance, naked in spirit, I shall follow Christ").

quoted fragment the author stresses another factor. The monarch believed that his reign and his riches were of no use. These words match the ruler's statement that he wishes to pass the throne to someone better than him.

The question is why, according to Otto, his reign bore no fruit. As Bruno's work suggests, the emperor bemoaned the errors which he had made and which he wanted to rectify in the foreseeable future. He must have meant strategic and tactical errors in the technical sense of the term. But did he mean only them? In medieval Latin *erratum* denoted not just an "error", a "mistake", but also sin. Thietmar's example teaches us that the causes of a king's political defeat would be sought also in his moral decline. Therefore, it is highly likely that Otto III thought that his own sinfulness was, at least to some extent, responsible for the difficulties he encountered in his public life, and in intending to pass the throne to someone else, he meant a man better than himself also in moral terms.

We find another interesting piece of information later on in the work. A friend of Bruno's, Benedict (later abbot of the Międzyrzecz abbey), bemoaned the fact that the emperor, disregarding his pledge, had not abandoned the throne. Until recently Benedict believed that the ruler, having left the throne to a wise man, would become a monk in Jerusalem. It is a thought-provoking detail, because it gives us the right to conclude that Benedict saw in Otto the emperor of the end of time.[193] However, this did not correspond to the conviction of the monarch himself, as is suggested by Bruno's reaction. Without taking up the Jerusalem thread, even in the polemical sense, he firmly states that the ruler abides by his decision to enter a monastery and that he intends to follow Benedict and go to the lands of the Slavs.[194] So the emperor was thinking not about the Holy Land but about Central Europe.

We learn two things here. First, Otto III's monastic plans were discussed in his milieu, and although some doubted whether the emperor really wanted to honour his pledge, the pledge itself was not doubted.[195] However, our attention is also drawn by the information that the emperor wanted to take refuge in a hermitage that was being founded in Poland. There is another instructive

---

193   This is the view of, e.g. Eickhoff, who believes that Benedict's words expressed the intention of the emperor himself (*Kaiser Otto III.*, 327).

194   *Vita Quinque Fratrum*, cap. 3, 38. The difference between Benedict and Bruno in their interpretation of the emperor's intentions has rightly been pointed out by R. Wenskus, *Studien*, 100.

195   All suggestions included in *Vita Quinque Fratrum* that Otto III really wanted to become a monk are meticulously gathered and commented on by Valérian Meysztowicz, "La Vocation monastique d'Otton III," *Antemurale* 4 (1958): 27–69.

fragment in the *Life of the Five Brethren*. The scene in which the ruler publicly pledged to abandon this world is followed by these words:

> Huius rei gratia fratres ex heremo, qui essent feruentes spiritu in Sclavoniam dirigere gloriosus cesar cogitauit, ut ubi pulchra silua secretum daret, in christiana terra iuxta terminum paganorum monasterium construerent, essentque tripla commoda querentibus uiam Domini, hoc est: nouiter uenientibus de sęculo desiderabile cenobium, maturis uero et Deum uiuum sitientibus aurea solitudo, cupientibus dissolui et esse cum Christo euangelium paganorum.[196]

We know from elsewhere that the initiative to bring to Poland monks who would undertake evangelizing work came from Bolesław Chrobry.[197] Otto is presented here as a person highly interested in this venture. The first words of the quoted excerpts—*huius rei gratia* ("for this reason" that is, the pledge)—demonstrate that in supporting the establishment of a monastery in Poland, the monarch did this with himself in mind. As a monk he was to have found his refuge there.

The fragment also tells us what tasks the monastery in question was to fulfil. They were threefold and—we could say—comprised three stages. Novices were to find there a cenobium, monks who were already formed—a hermitage, and those who wanted to be with Christ were to have an opportunity to do missionary work. The meaning of preaching the Gospel to the pagans was associated not only with the spread of Christianity but also an opportunity to shed blood for Christ. It can even be said—as the text unequivocally suggests—that the highest value of missionary work was in its being crowned by martyrdom.[198]

There is no doubt whatsoever that this thesis reflects the views of Bruno of Querfurt himself. His writing and his life testify to how highly he valued martyrdom and how much he desired it. But the hagiographer attributed these views to Otto III and there are no grounds to regard his opinion as false. It

---

196   *Vita Quinque Fratrum*, cap. 2, 35 ("For this reason, glorious Caesar decided to send the brothers from the wasteland who were fervent in spirit into Sclavonia, so that they could build a monastery in the Christian territory at heathen border, where he would give them a place of concealment in beautiful forests. There they would be of threefold benefit to those seeking the way of the Lord: for those newly coming from the world they would provide a desirable cloister; a golden solitude for the mature, thirsting for the living God; and for those desiring to be dissolved and to be with Christ, they would be a gospel to the heathens").

197   *Vita b. Romualdi*, cap. 27, 61.

198   Leclercq, "Saint Romuald," 307–323.

was the emperor who provided for such tasks for the monastery to which he wanted to send some monks from Pereum. And these were tasks which he himself was ready to undertake after entering the monastery in Poland.[199] A mission, especially one ending in martyrdom, was part of the essence of apostolic life, as it was understood in the Middle Ages. Thus, Otto III wanted to be an apostle. He was one as an emperor and he wanted to remain one also after his conversion.

The following interpretation might be put forward: in the last few years of his reign, Otto followed the path set by St. Adalbert, at least in the sense that as an emperor and with means available to his office he tried to spread Christianity among the pagans and create ecclesiastical institutions for them. In the last year of his reign he toyed with the idea of following Adalbert in the literal sense.[200]

Otto's pledge is also mentioned in Peter Damian's *Life of St. Romuald*.[201] The context in which the hagiographer writes about the matter would suggest that by making the relevant pledge to Romuald, the monarch was guided by a desire to atone for the perjury that supposedly caused Crescentius's capture and execution. If this is how the hagiographer understood the matter—the text, let me repeat, is not clear—he was mistaken. After all, we know that no perjury on behalf of the ruler in fact took place and that the ruler did not regard the execution of Crescentius as a sin. Something else matters, however. We have at our disposal a text—admittedly, a relatively late one—essentially confirming Bruno's account. In addition, we know that Peter Damian, when writing his work, did not have the *Life of the Five Brethren* before him.[202] He drew on a tradition independent of that source.

In such a situation it would be difficult to doubt the fact that Otto III publicly pledged to enter a monastery. Disputing two independent accounts would have to be regarded as excessive criticism. It would be difficult to justify it for at least two reasons. Firstly, the author of one of the accounts was Bruno of Querfurt, a very well-informed man and very likely an eyewitness to the event.

---

199   That Otto III desired martyrdom is stated clearly by Bruno in another fragment, *Vita Quinque Fratrum*, cap. 7, 47.

200   See Sansterre, "Otton III," 405.

201   *Vita b. Romualdi*, cap. 25, 53.

202   That Peter Damian wrote independently of Bruno of Querfurt has been discussed by Giovanni Tabacco in the introduction to *Vita b. Damiani* (p. LVIII, fn. 2) and Meysztowicz ("La Vocation monastique," 46).

Secondly, the event itself is probable, if we take into account the emperor's ascetic attitude and his deep sense of sinfulness.[203]

I am, of course, perfectly aware of the fact that some scholars are ready to question the reliability of the accounts in question and reject the thesis concerning Otto III's monastic vocation. German scholars in particular excel at this.[204] These historians point mainly to the fact that when the ruler was supposedly making the pledge in public, negotiations were going on for the Porphyrogenita's hand. However, this argument is not strong enough to undermine Bruno of Querfurt's testimony supported by Peter Damian's account. In the end, the envoys who went to Constantinople to fetch the bride set out probably in the early winter of 1000–1001 or even earlier,[205] that is, before the monarch announced his will to take monastic vows. Thus, it was not the case of the ruler saying one day he was entering a monastery and on the following day sending matchmakers to seek a princess' hand in marriage. Naturally, the pledge may have been followed by a period of reflection and the emperor may have begun to wonder what he would do, if the bride did arrive from Constantinople. He may have also wondered whether it might not be better to withdraw his pledge. However, the very fact of making the pledge is beyond doubt,[206] as is the fact that the monarch made it in all seriousness.[207]

Let us return to the conjecture that the errors prompting Otto to abdicate were not only strategic and social but also moral. The emperor was convinced that as a result of these errors his reign did not bear good fruit. If this is how we understand the relevant fragment of the *Life of the Five Brethren*, we will have a fresh view of Otto's ascetic life, also from the period preceding the making of

---

203 See Althoff, *Otto III.*, 182–183.

204 Various opinions are presented by Görich, "Otto III," 31, fn. 101. Among Polish scholars, this scepticism is shared by Strzelczyk, *Otton III*, 179–181; Urbańczyk, "Zjazd Gnieźnieński," 66.

205 Uhlirz, *Otto III.*, 341 with footnote 111.

206 The authenticity of the pledge has been supported by e.g. Meysztowicz, "La Vocation monastique"; Sansterre, "Otton III," 403–407; Seibert, "Herrscher und Mönchtum," 244–245.

207 Mathilde Uhlirz may not have been entirely right when she wrote: "Dass Otto damals Romuald versprochen habe, seine Fehler gutzumachen, nach Ablauf von drei Jahren der irdischen Herrschaft zu entsagen und selbst Mönch zu werden [...] scheint mir eine unüberlegte Äusserung des Kaisers, die einer augenblicklichen Überreizung entsprungen ist, gewesen zu sein. Gerade damals war seine, durch Arnulph von Mailand nach Byzanz überbrachte Werbung von Erfolg begleitet gewesen, und er musste für die nächsten Monate die Rückkehr des Erzbischofs und die Ankunft seiner Braut erwarten, so dass er schon aus diesem Grunde nicht das Dasein eines Mönches hätte wählen können" (fn. 80 on pp. 368–369); see M. Sansterre's dissenting position, "Otton III," 393, fn. 66.

the pledge. By devoting himself to penitential practices, the monarch sought not only to save himself, but also to prevent the Divine punishment that could strike the whole Empire for the monarch's sins.[208]

The spirit of asceticism and penance accompanied the emperor, as we know, for several years. However, nothing seems to suggest that the monarch thought about monastic vows throughout that time. By resorting to severe religious practices he wanted to cleanse his soul of sin. He had a profound sense of guilt, but he did not believe that the only remedy was an escape from the world, hermitage and martyrdom. However, at some point there came a crisis which may have been caused by political failures. Otto came to the conclusion that his sinfulness made it impossible for him to continue his reign.

4   Otto III's Spirituality and Religious Movements in Ottonian Europe

In order to define the sources of moral anxiety which plagued the young emperor, we need to assess the monarch's religiosity with reference to the worldview of the period. The most important thing is to establish the relations between holiness and worldliness, religion and politics, the temporal and the eternal order, as this relation was understood by representatives of the elites at the time.

One, very common political attitude among the Ottonian clergy was embodied by Bruno, Otto I's brother.[209] Appointed Archbishop of Cologne by Otto, not only did he take over pastoral duties from his predecessor, but he also undertook thoroughly secular tasks: bringing order into Lorraine, which constantly rebelled against the king, and representing his brother's interests in the Kingdom of the West Franks. In entrusting these tasks to Bruno, Otto I was not disappointed: his brother—an enlightened, skilful and loyal

---

208   This is the spirit in which Sansterre, "Otton III," 399, interprets the spiritual exercises in San Clemente. Cleansing himself of sins, the ruler sought God's grace for a great religious and political venture, i.e. his pilgrimage to Gniezno; a different opinion: Seibert, "Herrscher und Mönchtum," 243–244.

209   For information about Bruno, Archbishop of Cologne, see James H Forse, "Bruno of Cologne and the Network of the Episcopate in Tenth-Century Germany," *German History*, (1991): 263–279; Ludwig Vones, "Erzbischof Bruno von Köln und seine "Schule". Einige kritische Betrachtungen", in *Köln—Stadt und Bistum in Kirche und Reich des Mittelalters. Fest. Odilo Engels*, ed. Hanna Vollrath and Stefan Weinfurter, Kölner Historische Abhandlungen 39 (Cologne, Weimar and Vienna: Böhlau, 1993), 125–137 and the literature on the subject listed below in footnote 212.

man—provided him with support which he vainly sought among other family members and relatives.

The archbishop's political involvement was far-reaching. Suffice it to say that he personally commanded troops during military operations, and not only defensive operations at that. It is, therefore, not surprising that this involvement raised many moral doubts in German society at the time. Is it fitting—people asked—for a bishop to devote so much attention to affairs that were not God's affairs? Specifically, can his participation in military operations be deemed acceptable? Such voices were heard in the most distinguished ecclesiastical circles, for example in Mainz, a see which in 937–954 was occupied by Archbishop Frederick, a great opponent of Bruno and his policy. In particular, he could not come to terms with the latter's characteristic tendency to blur the boundaries between the secular and the spiritual, including between what was a matter for the king, and what was a matter for the bishop. He died shortly after Bruno became Archbishop of Cologne, but his ideas remained current in Mainz.[210] Their followers included, in some measure, Otto I' natural son, William, Frederick's successor as archbishop.[211]

The questions that were asked and the accusations that were formulated required answers. In order to justify Bruno's attitude, his immediate successor in Cologne, Folkmar, commissioned a biography of Otto's brother. He entrusted the task to Routger, a monk from St. Pantaleon's Monastery in Cologne, which Bruno had founded and in which he was buried.[212]

The author did not fail to mention his protagonist's political activity, nor did he try to play down its significance pretending that it was incidental in the life of the pious man. On the contrary, he highlighted it as much as he could, explaining to the readers that it was the late archbishop's main—

---

210   See fn. 213.

211   See Kretschmar, "Der Kaiser tauft", 141–142.

212   *Ruotgeri Vita Brunonis archiepiscopi Coloniensis*, Irene Schmale-Ott, MGH SS rerum Germanicarum, nova series 10, 2nd edition (Cologne and Graz: Böhlau, 1958). For more on the work, see Hartmut Hoffmann, "Politik und Kultur im ottonischen Reichskirchensystem. Zur Interpretation der Vita Brunonis des Ruotger," *Rheinische Vierteljahrblätter* 22 (1957): 31–55; Friedrich Lotter, *Die Vita Brunonis von Ruotger. Ihre historiographische und ideengeschichtliche Stellung*, Bonner Historische Forschungen 9 (Bonn: Röhrscheid, 1958); Ernst Karpf, *Herrscherlegitimation und Reichsbegriff in der ottonischen Geschichtsschreibung des 10. Jahrhunderts* Historische Forschungen 10 (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1985), 62–83; Patrick Corbet, *Les Saints ottoniens. Sainteté dynastique, sainteté royale et sainteté féminin autour de l'an Mil*, Beihefte der Francia 15 (Sigmaringen: Thorbecke, 1986), 53–58, 74–80; Odilo Engels, "Ruotgers Vita Brunonis", in *Kaiserin Theophanu. Begegnung des Ostens und Westens* 33–46.

thought of course not the only one—claim to glory, providing the most detailed argumentation in chapters dealing with Bruno's appointment to the Cologne see.

This took place in 953, in circumstances that were very difficult for Otto I: a large-scale rebellion against him broke out, involving his own son, Liudolf, his brother Henry, his son-in-law Conrad and many magnates; in addition, some bishops, contrary to expectations, did not take up arms against the monarch's enemies. Frederick of Mainz, for example, surrendered his see to the conspirators without a fight.[213] What is worse, the rebels turned to the pagan Hungarians for help. In the midst of all these events, the king summons Bruno and explains why he is naming him archbishop and what he is expecting of him.

The monarch expresses his joy at the harmonious collaboration between him and his brother.[214] Thanks to this collaboration, Otto's royal rule (*imperium*) has been enriched by Bruno's royal priesthood (*regale sacerdotium*). The ruler explains what he means by *regale sacerdotium*. It carries with it two values, as it were: justice, that is, ability to give to everyone what is due to him—this is a strictly sacerdotal aspect—and strength, fortitude allowing Bruno to oppose the enemy; this is a royal aspect of his dignity.[215] Otto also highly values his brother's learning and prudence. They are a guarantee that when a rebellion

---

213   For more on Archbishop Frederick, his political standing and conflicting opinions about him among his contemporaries and later generations, see Hoffmann, "Politik und Kultur," 38–39; F. Lotter, *Die Vita Brunonis*, 116 ff.; Heinrich Büttner, "Die Mainzer Bischöfe Friedrich und Wilhelm und das Papsttum des 10. Jahrhunderts," 1st edition 1966, in idem, *Zur frühmittelalterlichen Reichsgeschichte*, ed. Alois Gerlich (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1975), 275–288; Lotter, *Der Brief des Priesters Gerhard*, passim; Hehl, "Kaisertum, Rom und Papstbezug," 218–225.

214   *Ruotgeri Vita Brunonis*, cap. 20, 19 ff.

215   "Unum nos semper idemque sensisse nec umquam vota nostra in quocumque negotio discrepasse, dici non potest, frater dilectissime, quantum delector, et hoc est, quod in acerbis meis rebus me maxime consolatur, cum video per Dei omnipotentis gratiam nostro imperio regale sacerdotium accessisse. In te namque et sacerdotalis religio et regia pollet fortitudo, ut et scias sua cuique tribuere, quod est iustitię, et possis adversariorum sive terrori sive fraudi resistere, quod est fortitudinis et iustitię" (ibid., 19)—"It is not possible to express, beloved brother, how much I am delighted that we have always felt one and the same thing, and our opinions have never differed in any matter; and this is the thing that comforts me the most in difficult times, when I see that by the grace of the almighty God royal priesthood has been joined to our rule. For in you both priestly religion and royal strength prevail, so that you know to give each of them its due, as is demanded by justice, and you are also able to oppose both the terror and the deception of adversaries: this is strength and justice." For more on the notion of *regale sacerdotium* in

breaks out, the archbishop will try to put it down, even by military force, and will not be misled by theories that this is not a matter which should be dealt with by bishops. The author has the king say words that make us realize how wrong these theories are. Frederick—says the monarch—guided by such views, surrendered Mainz to the rebels and, as a result, contributed to the outbreak of a civil war, did great damage to him and to the state and, generally, with his conduct did great harm to good people, giving evil people many a reason to rejoice.

In the *vita* Ruotger returns to this issue many times and keeps saying that Bruno's political and military activities did not injure his episcopal dignity and pastoral duties, since the people entrusted to his pastoral care could enjoy peace and safety thanks to these activities.[216] He goes even further in his arguments, claiming that there is a link between peace and flourishing of virtues and piety. He stresses, for example, that Mainz, once a deeply religious city, was transformed into a hotbed of discord as soon as it fell into the rebels' hands. This means that Frederick—a veritable *bête noire* in the work—not only betrayed the king and sinned against public peace, but also failed completely in his pastoral ministry.[217] In order to make his apology more convincing, the author uses the notion of *pax Ecclesiae*. In earthly terms, peace creates conditions in which various church institutions and Christianity as a whole can develop. The *vita* is not lacking in fragments making its readers aware of how much Bruno's political activity strengthened the peace of the Church.[218]

Yet peace was not the only premise of Bruno's political and military involvement. There was also the matter of defending the monarch and his cause. Of course, it is true that Otto I was regarded as a guarantor of peace and, as a result, any rebellion against the ruler was at the same time a rebellion against public order. The author is aware of that and readily writes about the matter. However, there is no doubt that in his eyes forsaking allegiance to the king was a terrible deed regardless of its political consequences. At one point the biographer says that the conspirators, whom he calls supporters of the devil, raised their hand against the emperor, *per quem salus erat in populo*, and they did this in order to put out the "light of the world".[219] In another fragment he says that the rebels, yielding to the spirit of Satan, rose against the one

---

this fragment, see Hoffmann, "Politik und Kultur", 36; Lotter, *Die Vita Brunonis*, 122; Karpf, *Herrscherlegitimation*, 76.

216   *Ruotgeri Vita Brunonis*, cap. 23, 23–24.

217   Ibid., cap. 16, 14–15.

218   Hoffmann, "Politik und Kultur", 34.

219   *Ruotgeri Vita Brunonis*, cap. 10, 10–11; see Karpf, *Herrscherlegitimation*, 68–69.

anointed by God, *in christum Domini*, that is, against the king.[220] Expressions like "salvation of the people", "light of the world", "anointed by God" brought to mind the Son of God. In using them with reference to Otto, Ruotget was convinced that Otto was an image of Christ.[221] That is why a rebellion against the king was a work of Satan, whereas defence of the king against the conspirators was, in a way, a defence of Christ himself. Could Archbishop Bruno be blamed in such a situation for thwarting the plans of the magnates of Lorraine who rose against the one anointed by God—*in christum Domini*?

Let us return to the speech which the author attributes to the monarch. The idea expressed in it is that the ruler may benefit greatly from collaboration with his brother bishop for two reasons, according to the biographer: firstly, as a clergyman Bruno was well-versed in moral matters, secondly, as a prince of the Church he had at his disposal political and military force. However, we need to bear in mind that he was the monarch's brother and, consequently, his position was special. In the mid-10th century people still believed that the kingdom was ruled by the brothers. It seems that this was one of the sources of the broad prerogatives of the new Cologne metropolitan in Lorraine, prerogatives going far beyond regular powers of the Archbishop of Cologne on the one hand, and Duke of Lorraine on the other. In fact, Bruno served as a viceroy in the entire western part of the Empire. Bruno's dignity referred to by Otto as *regale sacerdotium*, too, must have derived its royal nature from the simple fact that the one bearing that dignity was member of the dynasty.[222] Otherwise Bruno's priesthood would not have been a royal priesthood and the term *regale sacerdotium* would have been out of place.

This does not mean that the idea of close collaboration between the monarch and the bishop in strictly political matters—idea presented in Otto I's speech—applied only to this special case. True, in this case the collaboration was particularly close, with the scope of tasks and powers assigned to the ecclesiastical side being exceptionally broad. However, the idea as such was broader. This is evidenced by the charges levelled against Frederick. Routger does not accuse him of high treason, but of maintaining a neutral position in the conflict between the king and the opposition, misunderstanding his tasks as a bishop. There is more evidence of that kind throughout the work.

---

220   Ibid., cap. 15, 14.

221   This has been raised in the entire literature on the subject.

222   Karpf, *Herrscherlegitimation*, 74–75; Odilo Engels, "Theophanu—die westliche Kaiserin aus dem Osten," in *Die Begegnung des Westens mit dem Osten. Kongressakten des 4. Symposions des Mediävistenverbandes in Köln 1991 aus Anlass des 1000. Todesjahres der Kaiserin Theophanu*, ed. O. Engels and P. Schreiner (Sigmaringen: Thorbecke, 1991), 31–36.

Ruotger writes very emphatically and, at the same time, approvingly about the close relations between Bruno and Henry, Archbishop of Trier, as well as William, Archbishop of Mainz. These relations were manifested in various instances of collaboration, also on the battlefield, where the bishops fought side by side. For this was the only way to curb the barbarity of those children of the Church who, despising admonitions of bishops, did harm to others and to their own salvation. In the same chapter the biographer also points to the role played by Bruno in episcopal nominations. He would choose candidates who would contribute to the preservation and consolidation of peace.[223] Thus, the task of every bishop, not only the king's brother, was to care for the political prosperity of his people. This paved the way for a broad, completely secular, it would seem, collaboration with the king, the only guarantor of peace.

Ruotger's views, which must have been the views of Bruno himself.[224] Reflect a specific way of seeing the world. This specificity meant that the sphere of social reality, to which a religious meaning was attributed, was very broad. As a result, the differences between the political and the spiritual order were blurred, and the world emerging from this perspective was markedly homogeneous. Both orders had the ruler at the top. The ruler safeguarded peace, which was among any king's traditional duties, but at the same time he was anointed by God, was an image of Christ, and thus embodied the highest religious authority.

The blurring of the boundaries between the political order and the spiritual order had two consequences. Firstly, bishops felt obliged to serve the king, even in matters which—it would seem—belonged entirely to the secular domain. This was an aspect emphasized by Ruotger. Secondly, the ruler acquired the right to interfere in strictly religious affairs. These were two sides of the same coin. It is no coincidence that Frederick of Mainz, who did not intend to serve Otto I when conflicts between the king and the aristocracy occurred, did not want the monarch's interference in church matters to go too far.

The issue of the unity of the world is one that should be examined more closely. I shall try to describe it in greater detail using texts less politically involved than *Vita Brunonis*.

First, I shall focus on a document issued by the Bishop of Hildesheim, Bernward, in 1019.[225] That document is his testament, both in the legal and

---

223 *Ruotgeri Vita Brunonis*, cap. 37, 38–39.

224 See Hoffmann, "Politik und Kultur", 33.

225 An edition with an extensive philological and historical commentary can be found in W. von den Steinen, "Bernward von Hildesheim über sich selbst," *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters* 12 (1956) 331–362 (the source, 340 ff.). For more on Bernward's

the spiritual sense of the term. It contains a clause under which Bernward bequeaths all his property to the Monastery of St. Michael in Hildesheim, but the clause is preceded by an extensive descriptive fragment which is deeply philosophical. It consists of two parts. First, the bishop shares with the readers his views concerning human nature and relations between humans and God; then, using this as a background, he presents his spiritual history.[226]

Bernward is deeply convinced that man is a creature close to God; ontologically close, we would say. This stems from the very nature of man. After all, he was created by the Lord to serve the Creator rather than the creation. It is true that the allure of earthly goods distracts him, but his nature, shaped by the act of creation, always brings him on to the right path. In any case, human beings are not left alone. When they go astray, the breath of God puts them on the right track, and the deeper that breath goes inside them, the stronger they are bound to obey the Lord in all matters. This obedience is not possible without God's help, which is why the Lord leaves no one without his protection.

The author of the document illustrates these ideas using examples from the Bible. It is true—he says—that Adam sinned, but Abraham believed and this was regarded as righteous. Great and admirable were also the achievements of Moses, Elijah, David and Solomon. They differed among them in their merits and accomplishments, but in eternity they are all equal to the angelic spirits. The author notices here a certain disproportion between the accomplishment and heavenly reward, which is the same for everyone. He explains this by saying that the merits of a given person and their significance depend on the task entrusted to that person by God.

Bearing all this in mind, Bernward begins to outline his spiritual biography. When still a preceptor of Otto III, he wondered, inspired by God's grace, how he could earn the Kingdom of Heaven. He did not decide to embark on some enterprise straight away, because he knew that the modest means he had at his disposal were not sufficient to implement the plans he had in mind. Only when he became Bishop of Hildesheim by the grace of God, was he able to carry out his projects, that is, build churches and institute divine service in them, and thus to give all his wealth to the Lord.

At this point he proceeds to the various dispositions.

---

personality and his work, see *Bernward von Hildesheim und das Zeitalter der Ottonen*, vol. 1–2, ed. Michael Brandt and Arne Eggebrecht (Hildesheim and Mainz am Rhein: Bernward Verlag, 1993); among the papers published there, see in particular Otto Gerhard Oexle, "Bernward von Hildesheim und die religiösen Bewegungen seiner Zeit," 355–360.

226   This narrative causes many philological and hermeneutic problems. That is why the summary given below is at times a far-reaching interpretation.

As we can see, the Bishop of Hildesheim was inclined to believe that there was no abyss between God and man. The human beings seek their Creator, because such is their nature and because the Lord imbues his creation with grace. Satan—the person sowing discord between God and man—does not appear within the author's sight at all, and Adam's sin is presented not as original sin, causing the fall of the entire human race, but as personal sin, without any significance to the life of Moses or David. Therefore, it comes as no surprise that Bernward himself always thought about serving God.

This does not mean, however, that Bernward did not come up against obstacles on his way to salvation. Yet the obstacles were not so much spiritual, did not stem from human sinfulness, but were external, so to speak: before he became bishop, the author had not been able to found a monastery. Here we arrive at a rather unusual conclusion: Bernward's salvation was determined by his social and economic advance.

When taking up the issue of uniformity of the world, as it emerges from the analyzed document, we should point to the following facts: an eminent representative of the Ottonian episcopate was convinced that the hierarchy of holiness was not entirely different from the social, economic and political hierarchy; on the contrary, the two overlapped at least to some extent. That is why advance in earthly terms not only did not hinder progress on the path to holiness, but, on the contrary, facilitated it. Thus there was no reason for a man looking for God and desiring salvation to turn away from the earthly world or to distrust it. In this case the uniformity of the world would mean that the political and social structures met with full approval of someone who judged them from a religious point of view.[227]

Another text deserving some comments is *Vita Iohannis abbatis Gorziensis*,[228] a work written in 974–984 by John, abbot of the Saint-Arnoul monastery in Metz. It is an extremely valuable source for getting to know the spirituality animating the Gorzian monastic reform and for reconstructing the social space in which it was taking place at its beginning.[229]

---

227   For more on the uniformity of the world in European thinking around 1000, especially in Bernward's thinking, see Oexle, "Bernward von Hildesheim," 358 ff.

228   BHL 4396. The edition I use: Jean de Saint-Amoul, *La Vie de Jean, abbé de Gorze*, ed. and transl. into French by Michel Parisse (Paris: Picard, 1999). For information about the work, see the editor's notes, ibid. 5–39 as well as the works quoted in the two following footnotes; for more on the ideal of holiness, expressed in the *vita*, see works by Jean Leclercq and Giulia Barone quoted there.

229   For more on Gorze in the 10th century: L'*Abbaye de Gorze au Xᵉ siècle*, ed. Michel Parisse and Otto Gerhard Oexle (Nancy: Presses Universitaires de Nancy, 1993). For more on the

The protagonist of the work, John of Vandières, was born near Metz at the beginning of the 10th century.[230] He came from an affluent, though not aristocratic family. Some scholars even suspect that he may have been of slave origin. As a young man, he took over from his late father a landed estate, not thinking initially about consecrated life. Many chapters of the *Vita* deal with John's spiritual growth, which after a dozen years or so brought him to a monastery and then to the office of abbot. In this, the author takes an unusually broad view and shows his protagonist in relation to other people, primarily men, but also women desiring God and seeking a path leading to him.

The basic difficulty with which John and his companions grappled was a crisis in monastic life in Lorraine caused by the turbulence of the late Carolingian period. There was no monastery in the region that would meet their high aspirations. Hence the journeys to Italy and across Italy, hence the attempts at eremitic life, hence the constant search for a spiritual master, hence, finally, the idea of settling in a monastery near Benevento or Naples. Yet this constant search—which, after all, was combined with defiance of the situation in the Lorraine Church—did not lead to any conflict with the secular or the ecclesiastical hierarchy. There are no traces either of criticism denouncing moral vices and addressed to members of the elites—criticism that would come from John himself or his biographer. There are no suggestions that people wanting to live a pious life met with hostility from those with power and influence. On the contrary, the author stresses many times how much his protagonist benefited morally from his contacts with members of the social hierarchy, how much he owed to them on his path to God.

The readers get much positive information about the bishops of Lorraine dioceses, especially about Dadon, Bishop of Verdun, or Adalberon, Bishop of Metz. The former was very friendly to John,[231] while the latter gave the Gorze

beginnings of the Gorzian reform, see Michel Parisse, "L'Abbaye de Gorze dans le contexte politique et religieux lorrain à l'époque de Jean de Vendières (900–974)," in ibid., 51–90.

230   For information about John, his life and spirituality, see e.g. Jean Leclercq, "Jean de Gorze et la vie religieuse au Xe siècle," in *Saint Chrodegang* (Metz: Lorrain,, 1967), 133–152; Giulia Barone, "Jean de Gorze. Moine de réforme et saint original", in *Religion et Culture autour l'an mil*, 31–38; eadem, "Une hagiographie sans miracles. Observations en marges de quelques vies du Xe siècle," in *Les Fonctions des saints dans le monde occidental (IIIe–XIIIe siècle). Actes du colloque organisé par l'Ecole française Rome avec le concours de l'Université de Rome "La Sapienza"*, Collection de l'Ecole française de Rome 149 (Rome: Ecole française de Rome, 1991), 441–442.; eadem, "Jean de Gorze, moine bénédictin", in *L'Abbaye de Gorze*, 141–158; Otto Gerhard Oexle, "Individuen und Gruppen in der lothringischen Gesellschaft des 10. Jahrhunderts," in ibid., 107 ff.

231   Jean de Saint-Arnoul, *La Vie*, cap. 12, 50.

monastery to him and his companions, which enabled them to achieve their life objective.[232] It is also worth paying attention to some other representatives of the clergy. Berner, thanks to his learning and profound piety, played a part in John's spiritual growth, and was his superior appointed by the diocesan authorities.[233] On the other hand, Einold was the first to suggest that a convent be established and invited the protagonist to join him and other companions. At that time he lived a life of a poor recluse, but before that he had been the first archdeacon of the Diocese of Toul and a wealthy man.[234] And, finally, we consider the girl Geiza whose mortification became a source of spiritual breakthrough for John. A huge role in the shaping of her character was played by her aunt Fredeburga, Abbess of the Monastery of St. Peter in Metz, a friend of John's as well.[235] In addition, he owed much to secular aristocrats, such as Count Rukuin, whose mores he found edifying and from whom he received a church situated in his home village.[236] What about Lambert, a powerful lord? Thanks to his intervention with Bishop Adalberon, that group of men seeking God and holiness did not have to look for a home on foreign soil because they found it in Gorze.[237]

As we can see, all these were people high up in the social hierarchy or at least in the official hierarchy, and all played an important and positive role in the life of John of Vandières, which the biographer writing in the 10th century scrupulously notes down and fully appreciates.

It is also worth briefly examining monastic spirituality as it is presented in the work.[238] What comes to the fore among the protagonist's virtues is his attitude to his superiors.[239] This is not only about John's absolute obedience to Abbot Einold[240] and the humility he demonstrated in his dealings with the provost Frederick, his immediate superior,[241] but also about his great love for the former. The author draws our attention to the following event: in order to enable Einold to concentrate on contemplative life, John of Vandières out of his own will took over administrative duties from him.[242] This was a great

---

232 Ibid., cap. 35 ff., 70 ff.
233 Ibid., cap. 13, 52.
234 Ibid., cap. 29 ff., 64 ff.
235 Ibid., cap. 17, 56, cap. 33, 68–70.
236 Ibid., cap. 12, 50.
237 Ibid., cap. 36–37, 72.
238 Ibid., cap. 72 ff., 100 ff.
239 Barone, "Jean de Gorze, moine bénédictin," 144 ff.
240 Jean de Saint-Arnoul, *La Vie*, cap. 73, 102.
241 Ibid., cap. 74, 102–104.
242 Ibid., cap. 72, 102.

sacrifice for him, because the duties, especially contacts with the external world associated with them, did not allowed the monk to practise the various virtues as much as he wished.[243]

John of Vandières faced the same conflict of values as many other monks living in Antiquity and the Middle Ages. On the one hand, his greatest desire was to devote himself entirely to prayer and mortification. The hagiographer writes a lot about psalms constantly said by the monk, about his constant fasting and vigils. In addition, he notes that John studied the lives of the Desert Fathers and the great ascetics of the West, and took from them principles to follow in life. However, at the same time the biographer says that had the times been different, John of Vandières would have tried to emulate these saints.[244] The conditional used here by the author betrays the reserve with which the Gorzian reform monks looked at untempered asceticism. They admired it, but did not think that it could be applied in practice.

In John's case, the factor that imposed some restraint on him in this respect was obedience and love. We learn from the *Vita* that the monk lived on a very strict diet, not allowing himself even to eat salt. However, he had to give up this practice, when the abbot, afraid he would ruin his health, absolutely forbade it.[245] In all his mortification practices the protagonist of the *Vita* avoided any ostentation. He preferred to give up—at least for some time—an ascetic practice rather than follow it in front of others.[246] On the other hand, in no way did he put pressure on his brothers to choose some sacrifices. It seems he was guided by a desire not to force other monks with his ascetic "accomplishments" to do something that might have been beyond them.[247] And another example. The future Abbot of Gorze would spend whole nights saying psalms. But he sang them very quietly, no more loudly than humming bees, probably because he did not want to wake up his brothers.[248]

The biographer presents to us an ascetic who seeks salvation not only in self-mortification and contemplation, but also in being with his brothers, in being that respects the structure of a monastic community and its hierarchy, and who consequently limits his ascetic practices on the one hand, and lives a partly active life on the other. This attitude stemmed—it would seem—from a conviction that this being with others is significantly enriching spiritually and

---

243   Ibid., cap. 86, 114.

244   Ibid., cap. 84, 112.

245   Ibid., cap. 92, 120.

246   Ibid., cap. 93, 122.

247   Ibid., cap. 78, 106.

248   Ibid., cap. 80, 108; also cap. 78, 106.

that a monastic community, with its structure and hierarchy, did not hinder but facilitated salvation.

Let us draw some conclusions from reading *Vita Iohannis*. The author places the future Abbot of Gorze in two different social contexts: of the country and of the monastery. This is what makes reading the *Vita* so instructive. We are able to say that the biographer's and his protagonist's attitude to the social reality at the time was unequivocally positive and approving, both with regard to the small community of the convent and with regard to the community of the entire province.[249] In both contexts John sought God not in a conflict with the existing structures and hierarchies, but on the basis of them.

The sources we have analyzed enable us to say that in Ottonian times people were very optimistic about the earthly reality. They did not believe that social institutions, hierarchies or norms hindered salvation. On the contrary, they were convinced that the path to God was opened when they were fully respected and when people used the possibilities they offered. Bernward looked for a chance of salvation in social and economic advance, taking place in accordance with the existing rules of political life and norms of conduct. On the other hand, John of Vandières' spirituality developed thanks to his contacts with the secular and ecclesiastical elite in Upper Lorraine, while his holiness, growing in the quiet of the monastery, was greatly influenced by his love for his brothers and obedience to his superiors.

This optimism was far more profound than could be imagined. Let us remember that the Bishop of Hildesheim held a high opinion of the moral capacity of human beings. Not only did he have unshakable faith in Divine grace, constantly supporting humans in their life on earth, but he also did not attach much weight to the effects of the original sin; his opinion of human nature was extremely positive. Unequivocal acceptance of man had to necessarily lead to acceptance of social structures and hierarchies. For can beings who are by their nature good and supported by God's blessing create evil social structures and hierarchies?

This anthropological and sociological optimism begat political optimism. Since both individuals and collectives were trusted, there was no reason for denying trust to the king and the state organization which he crowned and

---

249   The openness of the Gorzian reform monks to the world is stressed by Phyllis G. Jestice, "The Gorzian Reform and the Light under the Bushel," *Viator* 24 (1993): 51–78. This openness was combined with a positive opinion of the world (ibid., especially 65); see also the image of 10th and 11th-century spirituality given by Phyllis G. Jestice, *Wayward Monks and the Religious Revolution of the Eleventh Century*, Brill Studies in Intellectual History 76 (Leiden: Brill, 1997).

symbolized. In such circumstances the idea of close collaboration between the clergy and the throne suggested itself particularly strongly. Bishops and abbots did not see a gap between their own world and vocation on the one hand, and the world and role of the monarch on the other; in addition, they were inclined to attribute important tasks in the life of the Church to him.

We shall find other views and other sensibility, when we focus our analysis on St. Romuald's monastic milieu. In his *Vita* of this great ascetic, St. Peter Damian describes the following event: the hermits living in Poland, known in the literature as the Five Brethren, decided to send an envoy to Rome to obtain the Holy See's permission to carry out a mission among the pagans. When Bolesław Chrobry learned about the plan, he asked them to take this opportunity to obtain the royal crown for him. The Brethren refused, explaining that they were not allowed to deal with secular matters.[250] As we can see, although Bolesław was their great benefactor, who had invited them to settle in Poland, they did not want to serve him in a most important matter. Moreover, in defending their principles they put at risk their relations with the monarch, on whose good will depended the prosperity of the entire convent. We are dealing here with an atmosphere completely different to the one in Cologne and Gorze in the 10th century.

The monastery was run by Italians associated with St. Romuald.[251] That is why in order to understand the attitude of the Polish hermits, we need to establish what kind of relations their master had with monarchs. Bruno of

---

250   *Vita b. Romualdi*, cap. 28, 62–63. See Aleksander Gieysztor, "Les Paliers de la pénétration du christianisme en Pologne au Xe et XIe siècle," in *Studi in onore di Amintore Fanfani*, vol. 1 (Milan: Giuffrè, 1962), 340.

251   For more about Romuald, see Walter Franke, *Romuald von Camaldoli und seine Reformtätigkeit zur Zeit Ottos* III., Historische Studien 107 (Berlin: E. Ebering, 1913). For information about the spirituality of Romuald and his disciples, see August Nitschke, "Die Wirksamkeit Gottes in der Welt Gregors VII.," in *Studi Gregoriani*, vol. 5 (Rome: Abbazia di San Paolo, 1956), 114–216, especially 124–135; Giovanni Tabacco, "Privilegium amoris. Aspetti della spiritualità Romualdina," 1st ed. 1954, in idem, *Spiritualità e cultura nel Medioevo. Dodici percorsi nei territori del potere e della fede*, Napoli: Liguori, 1993, 167–194; idem, "Romualdo di Ravenna e gli inizi dell'eremitismo camaldolese", 1st ed. 1965, in idem, *Spiritualità*, s. 195–248; Leclercq, "Saint Romuald," passim; Colin Phipps, "Romuald— Model Hermit: Eremitical Theory in Saint Peter Damian's "Vita beati Romualdi", Chapters 16–27," in *Monks, Hermits and Ascetic Traditions*, ed. William J. Sheils, Studies in Church History 22 (Oxford: Blackwell, 1985), 65–77. For more on the Italian eremitism in the 10th–11th century, see e.g. Jean-Marie Sansterre, "Recherches sur les ermites du Mont-Cassin et l'érémitisme dans l'hagiographie cassinienne," *Hagiographica* 2 (1995): 57–92.

Querfurt in the *Life of the Five Brethren* and Peter Damian provide us with some clues in this respect.

Romuald twice headed an imperial monastery: first he was the abbot at San Apolinare in Classe, Ravenna, then the master and the highest authority in the newly founded Monastery of St. Adalbert in Pereum. In both cases he exercised his leadership in an atmosphere of conflict. There were frictions both between Romuald and the monastery, and between Romuald and the emperor. The disagreements in his relations with the royal court in particular deserve our attention.

Romuald was forced to become abbot at San Apolinare by Otto III. He did not last long in this office. Throwing the abbot's staff at the emperor's feet in protest, he set out for Monte Cassino. In explaining their protagonist's attitude, both hagiographers cite the following circumstance: Romuald doubted whether he would be able to lead the monks entrusted to his care to eternal salvation; he was afraid that by remaining in the monastery, he would put his own soul at risk of condemnation.[252] However, the two authors differ somewhat in their interpretations. Bruno of Querfurt explains the difficulties encountered by the saint citing the proximity of the court, the fact that lay persons, by intruding on the monks, brought anxiety and confusion. Peter Damian, on the other hand, stresses the hardness of the monks' hearts—the monks did not want to resign themselves to the strict demands posed by their superior.[253]

Pereum was the place in which Romuald, surrounded by his disciples, founded his hermitage. Otto III began to erect a monastery by its entrance.[254] Yet the saint did not become abbot in this community of cenobites and hermits, but designated someone else to hold this office, settling for the role of master and spiritual supervisor. However, after just a few months he abandoned the brothers, and the whole enterprise proved to be impermanent.[255] As Peter Damian sees it, Romuald left, because, contrary to his wish, the abbot did not live in the hermitage but in the monastery, lured by the appeal of worldly life. Bruno of Querfurt does not think highly of this anonymous monk either, but he suggests that the crisis in the community was caused by the emperor and his entourage. He and his courtiers often came to the monastery, disturbing

---

252   *Vita Quinque Fratrum*, 32; *Vita b. Romualdi*, cap. 22–23, 47–50.

253   Cf. an interpretation of this fragment in Phipps, "Romuald—Model Hermit," 73. In that fragment by Peter Damian the author sees—and perhaps is right—some anti-emperor allusions. However, there is no doubt that the hagiographer's main attack is directed elsewhere.

254   See Dunin-Wąsowicz, ""Pereum" medioevale," passim.

255   *Vita b. Romualdi*, cap. 30, 65–66.

the monks; as a result of the monarch's interference the abbacy went not to the candidate chosen by the master, but to an unworthy man; and the direct cause of the saint's departure was the fact that Otto took two of his favourite disciples from him, assigning them to another master.

Unlike Peter Damian, Bruno of Querfurt personally knew the saint and witnessed many events mentioned here. Therefore, if he stresses the ruler's negative impact on this or that monastery so much, this must also have been the opinion of Romuald himself. The *Life of the Five Brethren* does not suggest that the "father of judicious hermits" was wary of the institution of the monarchy as such. However, he was clearly convinced that the monastery and the court, life dedicated to God and earthly matters should be completely separated. Otherwise, any monastic community would degenerate.

Yet Romuald does not occupy the central spot in the work, and what the author writes about him does not allow us to paint a fuller picture of the spirituality of the great hermit. We need to analyze *Vita beati Romualdi*, the author of which tried to depict his protagonist in as great detail as possible.

Secular magnates, cenobites and hermits—these are the three main social categories used by the hagiographer, and three worlds about which he writes and which he judges. The world of powerful and wealthy people, of kings and aristocrats, is a hotbed of sin. Romuald himself, before entering the monastery, belonged to this sphere. The gallery of the high and mighty opens with the saint's father. Completely engrossed in earthly matters, he was in dispute with his family about his patrimony. He did not hesitate to fight for his rights using force, and even when he killed an opponent, his hand did not shake. Moreover, threatening his son with disinheritance, he demanded that he, too, take up arms and fight alongside his father.[256] Another man who had blood on his hands was the Dodge of Venice Peter Orseolo I. His path to the throne was paved by a conspiracy in which he participated and which ended in the death of his predecessor.[257] There was also an anonymous count from southern Gaul who robbed a peasant of a cow.[258] Another great sinner was another count in the region—Oliban.[259] And what about the German Tammo, who promised inviolability to Crescentius, who was subsequently condemned to death?[260] Otto III was just as responsible in this case, since Tammo worked

---

256   Ibid., cap. 1, 14–15.

257   Ibid., cap. 5, 21–25.

258   Ibid., cap. 10, 31–32.

259   Ibid., cap. 11, 32–33.

260   I have pointed out elsewhere that St. Peter Damian presented Crescentius's case incorrectly.

on his behalf and was instructed by him.[261] Peter Damian does not fail to note this, but he does not stop here, for he points out two other transgressions to him: that he took Crescentius's widow as his concubine[262] and, contrary to his promise, he was not in a hurry to enter a monastery.[263] This delay in particular must have been a great misdeed, if the emperor was punished by death for it.[264]

Let us discontinue this recital. Rather, let us note that in most cases the sins in question were very serious. In order to atone for them, the rest of one's life had to be spent in the monastery. This does not mean that all the people mentioned by the author are villains in his eyes. On the contrary, some, for instance Otto, are mentioned by Peter Damian rather sympathetically, while others, having sought refuge in a hermitage, showed their great piety (for example, Peter Orseolo or Tammo). They were not evil, but, involved in the affairs of this world, they let themselves be possessed by it.[265]

Cenobites were not models of virtue either. Let me give a few examples. Romuald made his monastic profession at San Apolinare in Classe. As he was more zealous in living an ascetic life than others, some brothers wanted to kill him.[266] Later, he founded a monastery in Bagno di Romagna. Soon, however, a bitter conflict arose between the saint and the monks. The reason was that some of the money the master had received for the needs of the convent were given by him to another monastery which had been consumed by a fire. Moreover, the relations between the brothers and their spiritual father had already been strained earlier, because the saint did not want to accept their wicked mores. Eventually, the monks beat up Romuald and chased him out.[267] The hagiographer mentions another hermit, Blessed Venerius, as well. Initially, he lived in a cenobium, where he distinguished himself by his extraordinary humility and simplicity. As a result, he became the laughing stock of the entire convent and subject to constant insults, which is why he left the monastery and

---

261 *Vita b. Romualdi*, cap. 25, 52–53.

262 Ibid., cap. 25, 53.

263 Ibid., cap. 30, 66.

264 The hagiographer does not say this explicitly, but it can be concluded from the context, ibid., cap. 30, 66–67.

265 When introducing the figure of Sergius, Romuald's father, Peter Damian writers: "Huic [sc. Romualdo] erat pater nomine Sergius, mundo vehementer intentus et omnino secularibus negotiis implicatus", *Vita b. Romualdi*, cap. 1, 14 ("His father was named Sergius, greatly concerned with worldly things and deeply implicated in all secular affairs").

266 Ibid., cap. 3, pp. 19–20.

267 Ibid., cap. 18, 42–45. An insightful analysis of the relevant fragment is carried out by Phipps, "Romuald—Model Hermit," 70 ff.

took refuge in the wilderness. There, devoting himself to severe mortification for many years, he attained holiness.[268]

The social milieu which wins full approval in the hagiographer's eyes is the hermits. After all, it is no coincidence that the author devoted his work to a hermit. When describing the life in anchoritic communities, Peter Damian emphasizes, on the one hand, the severity of the life lived by members of the convent, and on the other, the harmony of relations in the monastic community.[269] As a result, the readers see the figures of pious men who can arouse both admiration and sympathy.

A question arises, however: what, according to the author, is the reason why the cenobites, unlike the hermits, are full of evil? We will find an answer in two fragments of the *Vita*. Let us first return to the scene in which the monks from Bagno di Romagna beat up St. Romuald and chased him out. Soon after that they held a sumptuous feast. They even dreamed of mead to season their wine. Medieval monks were obliged to eat very modestly, which was in any case regulated by detailed provisions. Yet the monks from Bagno di Romagna did not follow them, fond as they were of earthly goods.[270] In order to better capture the essence of this scene, we need to remind ourselves that in Peter Damian's opinion sin was caused by the senses.[271] Thus, the monks intemperance in food and drink speaks extremely ill of them: as we can see, they were completely susceptible to moral evil. Let us also recall the circumstances in which the protagonist left the monastery and hermitage in Pereum. He did not want to resign himself to the fact that the abbot lived not in the hermitage but in the monastery. The abbot began to live *saeculariter*, to live a secular life, and, consequently, strayed from the path of righteousness. In other words, a cenobium, unlike a hermitage, belongs to the world,[272] and the world—as can be concluded from the fragment in question—is overcome by evil.[273]

In the *Vita*, Peter Damian puts forward the following thesis: the only place in which man can escape evil is a hermitage. We can ask, however: to what extent

268   *Vita b. Romualdi*, cap. 24, 50.

269   See e.g. ibid., cap. 8–9, 28–31; cap. 26, 55. Of course, the harmony was not always ideal, see cap. 49, 91–92.

270   Ibid., cap. 18, 44 and the interpretation given by C. Phipps, "Romuald—Model Hermit," 71.

271   Robert Bultot, *La Doctrine du mépris du monde*, part IV: *Le XIᵉ siècle*, vol. 1, *Pierre Damien* (Louvain: Editions Nauwelaerts and Paris: Béatrice Nauwelaerts, 1963), 37.

272   This is the thesis of Phipps' article.

273   For more on Peter Damian's negative attitude to the world, see Bultot, *La Doctrine du mépris*, vol. 1, 45–52 and passim; on the meaning of the terms *saeculum, saecularis, saeculariter* in the writings of that Doctor of the Church, see ibid., 55 ff. See also Michel Sot, "Mépris du monde et résistance du corps aux XIᵉ et XIIᵉ siècles, *Médiévales* 8 (1985): 6–17.

do the hagiographer's views reflect St. Romuald's point of view?[274] After all, the author did not personally know his protagonist and the work is more of a treatise on eremitic monasticism than a historical work. It seems that at least when it comes to matters that are of interest to us here, Romuald's opinions did not differ significantly from what Peter Damian deemed right. Firstly, the author formulated his views remaining in constant contact with the tradition inspired by the great hermit. In addition, we know from Bruno of Querfurt's writings how distrustful St. Romuald was of the royal court.

Of course, we need to realize that there was nothing anti-royal in the hermit's attitude, nothing rebellious against political reality. On the contrary, St. Romuald persuaded people of Tivoli, for example, to humble themselves before Otto and acknowledge his authority.[275] This is more about a metaphysical view whereby earthly power, as belonging to this world, is exposed to the danger of sin and evil.

This was the attitude of the Five Martyred Brethren. They knew that the convent could exist only thanks to Bolesław Chrobry's piety and could certainly appreciate it. However, they were convinced that consecrated life could not be reconciled with the affairs of this world, because this could lead to sinful entanglement.[276]

Special attention should be devoted to Bruno of Querfurt. He was one of St. Romuald's disciples, but he differed from his master in his religious sensibility and views on spiritual matters to a significant degree. For a while he was an anchorite, but he could not find full consolation in a hermitage. He did settle in Pereum, but soon he came to the conclusion that his further stay at the hermitage would not bring him any spiritual benefit. He dreamed about a mission among the pagans or, in fact, about martyrdom that would crown it. In Romuald's eyes, on the other hand, life in a hermitage meant the fulfilment of the highest dreams and ideals; he became interested in the evangelization of pagan peoples fairly late, only after he learned about Bruno's martyrdom.[277]

---

274   Many scholars ask that question and leave it unanswered. See e.g. Giuseppe Fornasari, "'Pater rationabilium eremitarum': tradizione agiografica e attualisazione eremitica nella *Vita beati Romualdi*," 1st ed. 1983, in idem, *Medioevo riformato del secolo XI. Pier Damiani e Gregorio VII*, Nuovo Medioevo 42 (Naples: Liguori, 1996), 203–266; though there is no doubt that this scholar was nevertheless inclined to believe that the concepts presented in the *Vita* reflected the views of Romuald himself.

275   *Vita b. Romualdi*, cap. 23, 49–50.

276   Bultot, *La Doctrine du mépris*, vol. 1, 57–58.

277   Wenskus, *Studien*, 134–135; Leclercq, "Saint Romuald," 322–323.

This difference of views even led to a bitter conflict between Romuald and his disciple, when the latter was still in Pereum.

However, there must have been reasons why Bruno of Querfurt first left the imperial chapel and then the Monastery of SS. Boniface and Alexius on the Aventine and took refuge in the hermitage. We are witnessing here a spiritual anxiety plaguing the future martyr and forcing him to go from place to place. A solution to the riddle of the cause of this agitation can be provided only by the writings left by Bruno.

As we read the *Life of St. Adalbert* and *Life of the Five Brethren*, we come to the conclusion that the author was very pessimistic about the world and human beings. His favourite method of describing various characters, a method used in the works in question, is a kind of counterpoint: St. Adalbert's father was full of mercy and generosity for the poor, but at the same time sinned not with one but many women. St. Adalbert's mother was morally very chaste and spent a lot of time praying, but this is why she provided her husband with opportunities for adultery.[278] Initially, St. Adalbert himself cared only about earthly matters and only under the influence of God's grace did he renounce the pleasures of this world.[279] Benedict, one of the Five Brethren, devoted his life zealously to God, but in his youth he had committed the sin of simony.[280] Otto II was a valiant ruler who loved his subjects, often went to confession and prayed sincerely; nevertheless, his sins brought disasters onto the country.[281] And what about Otto III? He is praised so highly in the *Life of the Five Brethren*! This did not prevent Bruno from accusing his emperor of the gravest sins, a full catalogue of which he presented in a posthumous tribute devoted to his friend. I shall return to it in a moment.

This way of writing, which is more than just a literary device, reflects the conviction that man by nature is deeply entangled in sin.[282] Bruno exempted no one, not even himself, from this rule. It seems that his spiritual path was an attempt to free himself from moral evil by seeking more and more perfect

---

278 *Adalberti Vita II*, cap. 1, 3–4. For more on Bruno of Querfurt's ideology and spirituality, see Wenskus, *Studien*, passim; Leclercq, "Saint Romuald", passim; Strzelczyk, *Apostołowie Europy*, 210–229; Friedrich Lotter, "Christliche Völkergemeinschaften und Heidenmission. Das Weltbild Bruns von Querfurt", in *Early Christianity in Central and East Europe*, 163–174; idem, "Das Bild des hl. Adalbert," 77–107; in addition, fn. 392 in Chapter II.

279 *Adalberti Vita II*, cap. 7, 7; cap. 11, 10–13.

280 *Vita Quinque Fratrum*, cap. 1, 29.

281 *Adalberti Vita II*, cap. 9–10, 12, 8–10, 13–15. See Tomaszek, "Brunon z Kwerfurtu," passim.

282 Cf. Lotter, "Das Bild des hl. Adalbert," 105.

forms of penance and sanctification. In any case we know that a martyr's death attracted him precisely because he expected it to take away his sins.[283]

We can try to discern here considerable similarities with the anthropological and ascetic views close to St. Romuald and his disciples. Bruno was just as distrustful of the world and like them he tried to get out of it and free himself of it. He believed that abandoning earthly goods was a prerequisite for conversion. When describing St. Adalbert's spiritual transformation, he stressed that Adalbert gave up wealth and all kinds of vanity.[284] For a while Bruno tried to follow the path they had chosen. What made the Saxon cleric different from his Italian colleagues was a type of activism unknown to them. In order to put away his sins, he thought about martyrdom and this dream had perforce to drive him out of the hermitage. This activism is even more evident in Bruno's authentic interest in the evangelization of the pagans. He was interested in missionary work not only because it provided him personally with an opportunity of dying a martyr's death, but also because the conversion of pagan peoples was really close to his heart. He wrote with such great pain about Christian rulers who waged numerous wars but not in order to bring barbarian tribes to Christ's flock. He observed with such great bitterness that after Constantine and Charlemagne there was scarcely a king who would care about the spread of the Christian faith.[285]

Distrust of the world, characteristic of the Saxon monk, defined in some measure his attitude to German rulers. Apart from exceptional cases, that attitude was clearly negative. When Bruno criticized Otto II, Otto III and Henry II, he had specific reasons to do so and he expounded on them in his writings. But the fondness with which he took note of human sinfulness suggests that the severity of his judgements was influenced not only by objective facts but also suspiciousness stemming from his way of looking at the world. If Bruno writes that among the monarchs only Constantine and Charlemagne cared about the evangelization of the pagans, this means that Otto I's efforts in this respect were not appreciated by the hagiographer. I cannot answer with complete conviction why this was the case. Perhaps he saw something unworthy in the emperor's Christianizing activity, as he did in the chaste life of St. Adalbert's mother, which he so unexpectedly criticized. If this conjecture is correct, the assessment of Otto I's evangelizing activity was influenced not so much by his real accomplishments, but by the zealousness in tracking down evil and sin displayed by the Saxon cleric.

---

283   *Vita Quinque Fratrum*, cap, 2, 37.

284   *Adalberti Vita II*, cap. 11, 10–11.

285   *Adalberti Vita altera*, cap. 10, 9–10.

Bruno's spirituality was not without some influence on his political decisions. We know that he came into conflict with Henry II and in the king's war against Bolesław Chrobry he sided with the latter. For a German aristocrat, these were difficult, perhaps even tragic choices. It was because of an unfavourable political situation that he had to face such a dilemma in the first place. Yet, ultimately, his choices were determined by his religious outlook. Firstly, it drove Bruno to missionary activity, that is, to a clash with Henry II given the circumstances at the time, because the ruler was refusing to support this activity, at least on the missionary's terms. Above all, however, that outlook made the Saxon monk distrustful of emperors and kings, thus paving the way for mental and, consequently, also political independence from the reigning monarch.

Like St. Romuald, Bruno of Querfurt did not question the very institution of monarchy or its powers in religious and ecclesiastical matters. *Auriga Ecclesiae*—this is a role in which he would have loved to see Henry II.[286] However, the Saxon missionary was troubled by the thought that the ruler, like any man of the world, was sinful and for this reason very often failed to carry out his duties.

There is another type of spirituality that we should take into account. I mean here Cluniac religiosity, a powerful movement in Europe at the time, though its significance to the Ottonian Empire was not uniform. Present in Rome and Kingdom of Italy, it barely left is mark on Germany's spirituality. But it did have a significant impact on the Kingdom of Burgundy, which formally was not yet part of the Ottonian Empire, but which was linked by strong ties to it.

Let us refer in our analysis to three hagiographic sources: the *Life of St. Majolus* (BHL 5179), a homily devoted to that saint, and the *Epitaph of Adelaide*. The two works devoted to St. Majolus[287] make up one whole. They were written in 999–1010 in the milieu of Heldricus, Abbot of Saint-Germain-d'Auxerre and Saint-Jean de Réome, and were meant for Odilo, Abbot of Cluny.

The author of the *Vita*, focusing on the saint's spirituality, rather briefly presents the social milieu in which Majolus lived and worked. Nevertheless, we can say that the hagiographer does not look for and generally does not notice evil and sin among the persons surrounding his protagonist. The only

---

286   *Epistola Brunonis*, 98.

287   *Vita sancti Maioli*, ed. Dominique Iogna-Prat, in idem, *Agni immaculati*, 154–285; "Sermo de beato Maiolo", ed. Iogna-Prat, ibid., 287–301. In the book D. Iogna-Prat carries out an in-depth analysis of the Cluniac ideology manifested in the analyzed texts. In my analysis I follow in that scholar's footsteps. The book also contains detailed information on external criticism of both sources.

exception is the pagans. This does not mean, of course, that the problem of evil and sin among Christians does not appear in the work at all. Indeed, Majolus fights against Satan, liberates people from his clutches, chases demons out of them, frees them from the chains of error; but all these people are not specific individuals.[288] We are even unable to say which social category or which milieu the author means. There are some specific individuals but they are not presented as sinners. Although there is one exception, Otto II, but he, too, renounced sin, as soon as he was rebuked by the saint.[289]

Of particular importance is the fact that the rulers mentioned in the *Vita* are in all respects positive characters. When it comes to Otto I and Adelaide, the hagiographer truly waxes lyrical.[290] Trying to win Christ's approval, the emperor, who is called "the Great" in the work, puts a lot of effort into caring for monasteries. A modest man, he always takes his decisions after a profound reflection. As a result, all his endeavours are successful, enjoying God's grace. The hagiographer sums up his portrayal of Otto I by saying that the ruler was not only a diligent listener to the Word of God but also its ardent follower. In addition, we learn many good things about the empress, about her modesty, love for God and the poor, about her holiness and purity. The hagiographer notes that this purity by no means excluded marital relations. The author is not interested at all in his protagonist's relations with the West Frankish kings. The subject is mentioned only once in the work and this fragment, too, presents the ruler in a most positive light: Hugh Capet asks the Abbot of Cluny to reform the Saint-Denis monastery.[291]

Sins of kings are mentioned only once: Otto II persecuted his mother, suspecting her, without any evidence, of scheming against him. Severely reprimanded by Majolus, he changed his conduct and made amends for having wronged her.[292] This anecdote is highly instructive, because it reveals the Cluniacs' views on the social hierarchy: the Abbot of Cluny was someone greater than emperors or kings. He had the right to reprimand them, which was greatly beneficial to them and to the third parties.

In order to understand the premises leading to such conclusions, we need to examine the Homily on St. Majolus. It expounds a certain social theory. According to this concept, the Christian community comprises three estates:

---

288   *Vita sancti Maioli*, lib. II, cap. 11, 227–228.

289   Ibid., lib. III, cap. 11, 263 ff.

290   See e.g. ibid., lib. II, cap. 20 ff., 239 ff.

291   Ibid., lib. III, cap. 22, 282.

292   Ibid., lib. III, cap. 11, 263 ff.

knights, labourers, and the third estate, *tertius ordo*,[293] encompassing not priests and bishops, but monks.

They occupy a special place in society owing to the position they enjoy before God and owing to the functions they perform with regard to other people. A characteristic feature of the monks is virginity, a hugely important virtue in the author's eyes.[294] It makes them closer to the virgin Christ than other Christians. Although every Christian has the duty to follow the Lord, only the monks, who are celibate, can fully do it. The monks' privileged position will go beyond the end of time. In the future world they will sing a new song to the Lamb of God, while others who will be saved will not be given that possibility. But even here, on earth, worshipping God is the monks' main, though not the only duty. They also have obligations to the knights and the labourers: they should pray for them and with their own example encourage them to live in holiness.

In the light of this theory, Christian society is hierarchical, and its hierarchy is that of holiness. It has two levels. The upper level is occupied by the monks, that is, those whom God has chosen as his property,[295] and who, exempted from other duties, devote themselves only to serving the Lord. The lower level is occupied by the knights and the labourers. Although they are occupied by earthly concerns, they are not cut off from God and holiness. True, in the future world they will not sing a "new song", but they will listen to how this song is sung by the monks and they will rejoice in it without a trace of envy.[296] Therefore, if the author of the homily contrasts the third estate with the other two estates, he does so not to contrast goodness with evil but to distinguish two degrees of goodness, to distinguish those who live in closer communion with Christ. This is a way of seeing Christian society rather different from the one presented in *Vita sancti Romualdi*, where pious hermits were contrasted with lay persons and cenobites, mired in moral decline and sin.[297]

---

293   *Sermo*, 300.

294   11, 295 ff.

295   Ibid., 300.

296   Ibid., 297.

297   Iogna-Prat (*Agni immaculati*, 341 ff.) claims that around 1000 the Cluniacs assimilated and then interpreted in their own way the Carolingian social theory formulated in Auxerre, especially by Hericus (for more on Hericus's work and views, see Chapter 11, point 4). The theory had Neoplatonic overtones. Neoplatonism can also be found in *Sermo de beato Maiolo*, especially in its initial fragment, where, quoting Johannes Scotus Eriugena, the author presents a concept of God in whom every being has its beginning and to whom it always returns. See also Iogna-Prat, "Le Baptême du schéma des trois ordres," passim.

Let us return to the *Life of St. Majolus*. We can now understand why the hagiographer had such a positive opinion about the lay people with whom the protagonist dealt. They belonged to an estate close to God, though not as close as the monks. We also understand the sources of the Abbot of Cluny's superiority over kings and emperors. After all, Majolus was a monk, that is, a man much more strongly bound to Christ than any ruler. It is also clear why the saint was so successful in his admonition of Otto II. Moralizing was among the functions performed by the third estate with regard to the lower estates.

Let us now turn to the *Epitaph of Adelaide*, a work written by Odilo, Abbot of Cluny, shortly after Otto III's death.[298] Commemorating Otto I's wife, it very distinctively reflects the Cluniacs' views on the position of the ruler in the hierarchy of holiness.

Adelaide (d. 999) was princess of Burgundy. In 947 she married Lothar, who in the same year crown himself King of Italy. After the death of her husband in 950, she inherited the right to the throne, in accordance with the Lombard custom, and, through marriage, transferred it to Otto I. That is why at the German ruler's side she was more than just the wife of a king and an emperor. Thus, there was a grain of truth in Odilo's opinion that Adelaide, by joining Germany and Italy, expanded the realm as no one before her. Yet, taking into account these circumstances—real but of rather modest importance—the holy abbot considerably developed the idea concerning Adelaide's key role in the history of the empire. He claimed that she had subordinated Germany and Italy to the power of Rome, putting Otto as emperor at the helm of the Eternal City.[299] He did not fail to stress either that she had been the mother of many emperors,[300] that she had strengthened the Empire when her son had

---

298   *Die Lebensbeschreibung der Kaiserin Adelheid von Abt Odilo von Cluny*, ed. Herbert Paulhart, Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung, Ergänzungsband 20, 2 (Graz and Cologne: Böhlau, 1962), text on 27–45. An in-depth analysis of the source from the point of view that is of interest to us is carried out by Bornscheuer, *Miseriae regum*, 41–59; see also Corbet, *Les Saints ottoniens*, 59–64, 81–110.

299   *Die Lebensbeschreibung*, cap. 3, 32. "Hec [sc. Adelheida] enim augustarum omnium augustissima nominari ac venerari est digna. Nemo ante illam / Ita auxit rem publicam / Cervicosam Germaniam / ac fecundam Italiam / Has cum suis principibus / Romanis sub-didit arcibus. / Ottonem regem nobilem / Rome prefecit cesarem, / Ex quo genuit filium / Imperio dignissimum" ("She is worthy to be called and venerated as the most august of all empresses. Before her, no one enlarged in such a way the empire; she subdued from Roman heights stubborn Germany and fertile Italy with her generals. She chose Otto, the noble king, as the ruler of Rome, and by him bore a son most worthy of rule").

300   *Die Lebensbeschreibung*, cap. 4, 33.

taken over power and that she had put her grandson, Otto III, on the imperial throne.[301]

Where was the cause of such great accomplishments in international politics? Odilo refers first of all to the will of God. God made Adelaide marry a king,[302] he made her empress,[303] ruler of the world;[304] and it was thanks to God that after the death of Otto I the Empire did not collapse but was strengthened.[305] The Lord would constantly grant his blessing to Adelaide and her Empire, and he did so on account of her merits.[306]

Among the merits a prominent place is occupied by pious foundations and—more generally—generosity. With great munificence she gave to Christ, canons, the religious, monks and nuns, as well as ordinary poor people. There were several aspects to the meaning of these deeds. First of all, they were a form of homage to Christ. This is best evidenced in the statement that Adelaide founded as many monastic houses in honour of the King of kings as she had kingdoms by the grace of God. In this context the author mentions three male monasteries: of the Virgin Mary in Payerne/Peterlingen, of St. Saviour in Pavia and of St. Peter the Apostle in Selz, as well as a female monastery in Saxony (of St. Andrew in Magdeburg).[307] This should be understood as saying that the founding of an abbey was a solemn recognition of the fact that the founder possessed a given kingdom as a gift from God. Secondly, the deeds in question obtained prayers of intercession said by canons and monks for the empress and the realm.[308] Finally, the third aspect. It was appropriate for Adelaide, given her imperial dignity, to dress elegantly and adorn her head with the most precious jewels. However, the empress preferred to give the precious stones as alms for the poor or for the purpose of decorating crosses and Evangeliaria. In this way she imitated the Saviour, who, although he was God, did not scorn human nature.[309]

We have here the motif of kenosis or self-emptying modelled on that of Christ. The motif is very emphatically presented in the work. As the author tells us, there were three periods of great suffering in Adelaide's life: after the death

---

301   See below.

302   *Die Lebensbeschreibung*, cap. 1, 29.

303   Ibid., cap. 2, 31; cap. 3, 32.

304   Ibid., cap. 4, 32.

305   Ibid., cap. 5, 33.

306   Ibid., cap. 5, 33; cap. 7, 35.

307   Ibid., cap. 8–10, 36–37.

308   Ibid., cap. 11, 38.

309   Ibid.

of her first husband Lothar, when she was held in captivity by Berengar II; during the reign of Otto II, owing to a rift with her son; and during Otto III's minority. In this last case the cause of anguish was the hostile attitude to Adelaide of her daughter-in-law Theophanu. The sufferings did not result from the protagonist's asceticism and devotions. They were inflicted by enemies. In a higher sense, however, they were sent by God. They were not a form of punishment for sins, and neither was the serious illness that struck Adelaide during her first widowhood. According to the author, these painful experiences were a gift from heaven. They were to purify Adelaide internally and help her master her carnal desire.[310] This is how the empress's holiness was formed. Thus, if Odilo explained the empress' political greatness by pointing to her merits, he indirectly referred to these sufferings sent by God.

But there was a more profound thought in this as well. The abbot drew on the theology of St. Paul, who saw suffering as a prerequisite for salvation. The author quotes words by Adelaide herself, commenting on the wrong done to her by those around her and by strangers:

> Dicebat enim sepe illud apostolicum: *Existimo enim, quod non sunt condigne passiones huius temporis ad superventuram gloriam, que revelabitur in nobis*. Et alio loco: *Si* compatimur, *et conregnabimus*. Et iterum: *Si fuerimus socii passionum*, erimus et consolationis.[311]

The meaning of the quotations from St. Paul's letters,[312] which the empress invoked, is as follows: suffering paves the way for salvation. However, the second quotation contains the verb *conregnare*, which can be interpreted in two ways: reigning with Christ here on earth or in eternal life in heaven. While St. Paul must have certainly meant eschatological salvation, in the early Middle Ages both interpretations were regarded as admissible. When the quotation referred to a king, both interpretations were considered to be valid, because a ruler's earthly reign was regarded at the time as anticipating the future reign

---

310   Ibid., cap. 1, 30.

311   Ibid., cap. 7, 35 ("And he spoke often in the words of the apostle: *I believe indeed that the suffering of this time is not equal to the glory that will overcome us and be revealed in us*. And elsewhere, as the apostle says: *if* we suffer together, *we shall also rule together*. And again: *if we are companions in suffering*, we shall be companions also in consolation").

312   The fragment contains literal or distorted quotes from Rom 8:18, 2 Tim 2:12 and 2 Cor 1:7. Deviations from the Vulgate in the text in the previous footnote are given in Antiqua.

with the Saviour in heaven.[313] According to the coronation formula recommended in the Romano-German Pontifical, a metropolitan was to pray that the king on whose head he placed a visible crown be allowed to enjoy eternal glory with Christ at the end of time.[314]

This was Odilo's point of view as well. When he was writing the Epitaph, the empress had not yet been canonized, but he nevertheless regarded her as a saint. He was in no doubt that she reigned with the Saviour in heaven. At the same time, however, he assumed that Adelaide's suffering had paved the way for her to reign on earth. Indeed, the three periods in the protagonist's life full of painful experiences preceded years of political triumph: revival of the Empire and coronation of 962, strengthening of the realm in the second half of Otto II's reign, and, finally, Otto III's imperial coronation.

The work in question reflects the conviction that a ruler is an image of Christ. Adelaide's life is presented precisely in accordance with this idea. Every time a political triumph is preceded by deep humiliation, as was the case with the Saviour: first humiliation, then reign. In Odilo's view, the empress's *christomimesis* is a gift from God: God directed the protagonist's life in an appropriate manner. But she, too, tried to follow the concept in question in her conduct. In this spirit she reflected on the letters of St. Paul, and in giving up her robes and jewellery, she consciously imitated Christ, who, disregarding his Divine glory, had emptied himself (Phil 2:6). It is worth bearing in mind that the last act of this God-directed *imitatio* was death, followed by reigning in heaven with the Saviour.

There are several points in common between the views of the author of the *Life of St. Majolus* and the views expressed in the *Epitaph*. In both cases the ruler is a positive figure in all respects. In both cases, too, the authors put a lot of emphasis on the role performed by monks for the monarch. The anonymous hagiographer mentions the pastoral role and the prayer of intercession said by the "third estate" for the other estates. Odilo's work mentions the significance of the monks' prayer for the empress, though a different aspect is even more strongly emphasized: the empress's spiritual life was to a large extent pursued by supporting monks, nuns and their monasteries. On the other hand, the authors

---

313   See Percy Ernst Schramm, ""Mitherrschaft im Himmel": Ein Topos des Herrscherkultes in christlicher Einkleidung (vom 4. Jahrhundert bis in das frühe Mittelalter," 1st ed. 1966, in idem, *Kaiser, Könige und Päpste. Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Geschichte des Mittelalters*, vol. 1 (Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1968), 79–85.

314   *Le pontifical Romano-Germanique du dixième siècle*, vol. 1, ed. Cyrille Vogel and Reinhard Elze, Studi e testi 226 (Vatican City: Biblioteca apostolica Vaticana, 1963), cap. 72, no. 22, 257.

do not think much of rulers' ascetic practices involving self-mortification. While in the corpus of texts dealing with St. Majolus this may be a result of the perspective adopted in them, in the case of the *Epitaph*—a work focused on Adelaide's spiritual life—this fact becomes telling. Severe, long fasting, hair shirts, sleeping on a hard bed, going on pilgrimages barefoot—all this was not apparently necessary to attain holiness.

Readers of the Cluniac texts analyzed here may have the impression that holiness and royalty are not mutually exclusive. Firstly, life in the world does not bring with it any significant danger to the soul. This was a traditional Cluniac view. Already St. Odo had taught that lay people could attain eternal glory.[315] Secondly, holiness does not require religious practices and sacrifices that could not be reconciled with the role of ruler. Giving alms, supporting the poor, being friends with monks, founding monasteries—any king could afford to do that without neglecting his duties. However, sometimes we cannot help thinking that Odilo's optimism was based on another premise as well. Being a monarch seemed to him as an anticipation of the reign in heaven.

Let us now collect the conclusions of this subchapter.

We have looked on religiosity at the turn of the millennia mainly from one point of view. The idea has been to establish the attitude of the Church at the time to the world, its institutions, values and hierarchies. As we have seen, the views we have examined were not uniform. On the one had, we have an attitude represented and expressed by Archbishop Bruno and Ruotger of St. Pantaleon, Bishop Bernward, John of Vandières and John of St. Arnulf. They looked at the social reality from different points of view. Ruotger was interested in kingship and problems of peace, Bernward reflected on the religious value of wealth, and John of St. Arnulf included in his perspective the social elite of Lorraine. Yet their views can easily be brought to a common denominator, namely approval of the values, hierarchies and people existing in the world. These institutions, values and hierarchies are not evil and neither are people identifying with them. The opposite is even true. Approval for these institutions and hierarchies, and even, to some extent, values, is a prerequisite for moral growth and salvation. Romuald and Bruno of Querfurt were of a different opinion. They were suspicious of the world, because they were convinced that people—perhaps with the exception of those who had taken refuge in a hermitage—were permeated with moral evil and sin. Perhaps not

---

315   Friedrich Lotter, *Das Idealbild adliger Laienfrömmigkeit in den Anfängen Clunys Odos Vita des Grafen Gerald von Aurillac*, in *Benedictine Culture 750–1050*, ed. W. Lourdaux and Daniël Verhelst, Mediaevalia Lovaniensia, series 1, Studia 11 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1983), 76–95.

so much because they were evil themselves, but because they were exposed to the depravation of the world.

Working on the outskirts of the Empire were the Cluniacs. We know that although their attitude to kingship was positive, it was, nevertheless, somewhat patronizing. They believed in the superiority of monks to emperors and kings, with all the political consequences of that fact. Ottonian rulers usually maintained close links with Cluny, an attitude expressed in rich gifts full of symbolic content sent there by, for example, Henry II.[316] However, the Liudolfingians did not let the Cluniacs into Germany, despite the latter's hopes and efforts. The German rulers saw a danger not only in that patronizing attitude to which they did not want to expose themselves, but also, perhaps above all, in the organizational structure of the Cluniac congregation with the powerful Abbot of Cluny at the top.

However, if we leave aside the special role attributed in that monastery to the monastic estate, we will have to say that in many points of interest to us, the Cluniac worldview was similar, if not identical to the worldview of the German circles. Let me enumerate: having a positive attitude to the world, not valuing mortification of the body too highly, seeing Christ's image in kings.

A question now arises as to which of the attitudes listed above had the biggest impact on Otto III's personality. When trying to solve this problem, let us first look at the description of the emperor's character by Bruno of Querfurt. It is included in Chapter 7 of the *Life of the Five Brethren*.[317]

When writing about the monarch's death, the hagiographer carries out a moral examination of him. He is generous with praise for the dead emperor, but more careful readers will not be deceived by the sweet-talk and will quickly see that they are dealing with scathing criticism. What emerges from the description is an internally broken personality. On the one hand, Otto III had far-reaching political plans. They were too ambitious ever to be implemented: the monarch wanted to restore the old glory to Rome. Moreover, the plans verged on sacrilege, because the ruler was reaching for the Eternal City, which by God's will belonged to the Apostles. On the other hand, the emperor was imbued with the spirit of evangelical radicalism. He dreamed of becoming a monk, a hermit, and even dreamed of martyrdom. His favourite company was that of monks. He devoted himself to religious practices with great zeal—so

---

316   See below fn. 324.

317   *Vita Quinque Fratrum*, cap. 7, 43–48. On the reliability of information given by Bruno in this chapter, see my remarks: Michałowski, "Die Politik von Otto III. in neuer Beleuchtung," 167–177, especially 169–170.

much so that he neglected his royal duties. He even failed to administer justice and protect the poor.

Bruno's account provides us with hardly any new information. Other sources, too, suggest—I have written about it in greater detail—that in politics the emperor was guided by the idea of the renewal of Imperium Romanum, with the concept having a thoroughly political dimension among several others. The monarch's ascetic zeal and spirit of penance are also mentioned by other authors living in that period. Bruno's testimony is valuable primarily because it places such a strong emphasis on the monarch's dilemma: great, imperial politics and, at the same time, deep involvement in spiritual life, with the two directions of his interests and activity being in conflict. If we are to believe our author—and why should we not?—Otto III neglected his duties as a judge, which were, after all, fundamental to any medieval ruler, focusing excessively on his devotions.

The emperor's spirituality lay at an intersection of two different worldviews and this was the cause of his quandary. On the one hand, a view close to Otto's heart was that there was a correlation between the social-political order and the religious order. He was convinced that as an emperor he was an image of Christ.[318] He was in no doubt either that the emperor was obliged to lead the Church, to strengthen it from the inside and conduct missions on the outside, and that in this work he could count on divine assistance. I have given many examples of such a way of thinking; for instance, the imperial titles from the last period of his reign or the seals from the first half of his independent rule, seals expressing the conviction that God's inspiration was with Otto.

But the monarch went a step further, claiming that a renewal of the Empire was inextricably linked to a renewal of the Church, that the two went hand in hand. In this he did not think that the great splendour which he wanted to bring to the institution of the Empire—manifested, for example, in the antique-styled court etiquette—was in any way contrary to the religious goals the monarch and his state were to serve. He sensed no dissonance here. Rather, he was inclined to believe that the greater the glory he would bring to the Empire, the easier for him it would be to carry out the tasks of an apostle and servant of the Apostles. His veneration for Charlemagne was an expression of this attitude.

In addition, Otto III believed that in exercising the office of emperor he could successfully follow the precepts of the Christian religion. Highly significant in this respect is the iconography of the dedication miniature

---

318   Michałowski, "Otto III w obliczu ideowego wyzwania," especially 57–63 and passim (with references to other literature on the subject).

from the Liuthar Codex.[319] It depicts Otto III with the Hand of God crowning him (or touching his head as a gesture of grace). At the same time, across the monarch's breast extends a band representing the Gospel and being supported by the Evangelical Beasts, an image symbolically expressing the truth that God instils in the ruler the entire teaching of Christ. In response, the emperor stretches his arms, cross-like. After all, the acceptance of the teaching of the Gospel means following the Saviour in his humility and suffering. The artist depicts Otto III in full majesty: on a throne, wearing a diadem (or receiving it from heaven). Clearly, there was no contradiction between exercising power as an emperor and being a Christian completely obedient to God—this is the least that can be said.[320]

It is easy to see that we are dealing here with a way of thinking characteristic of Archbishop Bruno and Ruotger. They, too, believed that the boundary between the secular and the religious order was completely blurred, so much so that the responsibility for many religious tasks lay more with the monarch than with the clergy. They, too, claimed that a king was an image of Christ. The mentality attributed to Bernward can also be observed in Otto III. Following the ideal of *Renovatio Imperii Romanorum*, the monarch was convinced that splendour understood in earthly terms did not distance people from God, but, on the contrary—it helped them come closer to him.

There is also an analogy between Otto III's and Odilo's views. As we remember, the holy abbot saw an icon of the Saviour in the emperor. In addition, he stressed that the ruler could attain holiness without having to abdicate.

The facts quoted here might prompt us to look for explanations of the monarch's political and religious views in the ideology of the German state Church and in Gorzian spirituality, perhaps also Cluniac spirituality. However, this would be too far-fetched a simplification. Fulfilment of imperial duties did not alleviate Otto's religious anxiety. For only religious anxiety can explain the

---

319   Aachen, Cathedral Treasury, fol. 15ᵛ–16ʳ.

320   I have presented my point of view in Michałowski, "Otto III w obliczu ideowego wyzwania," 57–63; with references to the older literature on the subject; among more recent works see: Ulrich Kuder, "Die Ottonen in der ottonischen Buchmalerei. Identifikation und Ikonographie," in *Herrschaftsrepräsentation im ottonischen Sachsen* 162–190; Wolfgang Christian Schneider, "Imperator Augustus und Christomimetes: Selbsbildnis Ottos III. in der Buchmalerei", in *Europas Mitte um 1000*, vol. 2, 802–806; Körntgen, *Königsherrschaft*, 178–211. While Schneider abides by the traditional interpretation of the image, Kuder and Körntgen are decidedly against it. This, however, is not a place for presenting my opinion on this discussion. I shall just note that the legitimacy of the minimum interpretation presented in the book is beyond doubt.

monarch's perseverance in penance and mortification—going far beyond the accepted custom for rulers at the time—and the sense of sinfulness in which he constantly lived. This could be regarded as spiritual affinity with St. Romuald and Bruno of Querfurt. According to the principles they subscribed to, man was very sinful by nature. The Italian hermit believed that the best way to escape the clutches of evil was to live in a hermitage. The Saxon monk, too, highly valued renunciation of the vanity of this world, but he had more confidence in martyrdom. In any case, both were of the opinion that a man of the world, that is, a ruler, could not go safely through life. Although Bruno never said that it was impossible—we even have to take into account the fact that he may not have fully realized such an opinion—the severity with which he judged kings and princes shows that this is what he thought. When it comes to Romuald, we can say that were his *vita* to be regarded as reliable, this was a programmatic attitude: he believed that only by breaking all the ties with the world could one be liberated from evil.

The similarity of thinking between the emperor and the monks was most evidently manifested in the fact that Otto was attracted to hermits. He sought spiritual care from Romuald, was friends with Bruno, was fascinated by Italian-Greek ascetics, who either were simply anchorites or with the austerity of their life resembled hermits rather than monks living in Benedictine cenobia. We know that he tried to get close to St. Nilus and that St. Gregory of Cassano was entrusted by him with the Monastery of SS. Apollinaris and Nicholas he was founding near Aachen.[321] Moreover, he thought about entering a hermitage himself and even dreamed of a mission and martyrdom.

It has also been pointed out that the contacts between the ruler and the cenobitic Benedictines were much looser than between him and hermits.[322] All this suggests that when it came to spiritual life, the monarch was interested mainly in extreme forms of asceticism. Monks living in accordance with the traditional Carolingian and Ottonian customs had little to offer to the emperor. What a difference between Otto III, and his grandmother Adelaide as well as his successor Henry II! Adelaide founded three male cenobitic monasteries and was a great friend of St. Odilo and the Cluniacs. I have written about this earlier. Their devoted friends also included Henry II.[323]

---

321   Sansterre, "Otton III," passim; Seibert, Herrscher und Mönchtum," 215–250; Falkenhausen, "Gregor von Burtscheid," passim; Ekkehard Eickhoff, "Basilianer und Ottonen," *Historisches Jahrbuch* 114 (1994): 10–46; idem, *Otto III. in Pereum*, passim.

322   Seibert, "Herrscher und Mönchtum," passim.

323   Joachim Wollasch, "Kaiser Heinrich II. und Cluny," *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 3 (1969): 327–342; Seibert, Herrscher und Mönchtum, 220–222; see also Joachim Wollasch,

It is worth reflecting of the effects of this spiritual dilemma. The so-called imperial version of the *Life of St. Adalbert* contains the instruction which the future martyr gave to the Roman emperor. It is tinged with pessimism. Very few people will be saved; in order to achieve eternal life they should despise worldly goods and not pin their hopes on transient things. The Bishop of Prague did not encourage Otto III to abandon his throne. Instead, he encouraged him to perform his royal duties diligently and justly.[324] However, the dilemma remained: how to reconcile disdain for worldly goods with a life of a great emperor, powerful, rich and surrounded with glory? St. Romuald saw in wealth, power and earthly glory a trap into which a man might fall, if he did not renounce them entirely, and this could happen provided he abandoned the world and took refuge in a hermitage. A traditional monastery was not sufficient for the purpose. St. Adalbert's position was not as radical, but we do know that he did not accept moral compromises.

And here the following hypothesis emerges. Until as late as 1001 Otto III's will was to remain on the throne and rule the Empire. Otto was convinced that in this way he would accomplish a task that was pleasing to God. However, he shared the view of those spiritual masters who saw great dangers in this world to the salvation of the soul. That is why he was afraid that as a ruler he would

---

"Cluny und Deutschland," *Studien und Mitteilungen zur Geschichte des Benediktinerordens und seiner Zweige* 103 (1992): 7–32.

324   *Adalberti Vita I*, cap. 23, 35. "Nam die siue nocte, cum turba locum dedit, sanctis allo-quiis aggreditur [*sc. Adalbertus*] illum, docens, ne magnum putaret se imperatorem esse, cogitaret se hominem moriturum, cinerem ex pulcherrimo, putredinem et uermium escam esse futurum; uiduis se exhibere maritum, pauperibus et pupillis monstrare se patrem; timere Deum ut iustum ac districtum iudicem, amare ut pium uenię largitorem ac misericordię fontem; sollicite pensare, quam angusta uia quę ducit ad uitam, et quam perpauci, qui intrant per eam; bene agentibus esset per humilitatem socius, contra delin-quentium uicia per zelum iustitię erectus" ("At night and day, whenever the crowd gave way, he (Adalbert) approaches him with blessed speech, instructing him that he should not believe himself to be a great emperor, that he should remember that he is a mor-tal man, that he would be ashes from the most beautiful form, a rotting body and food for worms. He should show himself as a married man to widows, and as a father to the poor and orphaned; he should fear God as a just and severe judge, love Him as a loving dispenser of pardom and source of mercy. He should consider with care what a narrow path leads to life, and how few are those who travel upon it. He should be companion in humility to those performing good works, and lofty in the zeal of justice towards the sins of the delinquent"). See Ter Braak, *Kaiser Otto III.*, 216–219; Sansterre, "Otton III," 381–384. St. Adalbert's spirituality has not been well researched yet; it requires in-depth studies, see my remarks in the review of the 1st edition (2000) of Labuda, *Święty Wojciech biskup-męczennik—Kwartalnik Historyczny* 109 (2002), no.4: 138.

become proud in his life, that he would let himself be possessed by a lust for wealth and vainglory. In order to disentangle himself from this contradiction, he decided to devote his reign entirely to God. This would be the reason why Otto III so strongly, more strongly than his predecessors, emphasized the religious objectives he set for himself as a ruler. The culmination of these efforts came in the definition of the imperial reign as apostolicity and then as service to the Apostles. These desires were most emphatically expressed in the emperor's titles. However, these were by no means empty titles, because they reflected a policy which the monarch really pursued: as a servant of Jesus Christ he strengthened Christianity in newly converted countries, as a servant of the Apostles he watched over the papacy, leading the Church and missions among the pagans from the Eternal City. Having assumed such a concept of his rule, he wanted to live with the conviction that he reigned not for his own glory but for God.

This attitude bore fruit in the form of the Archbishopric of Gniezno. By having it erected, Otto III sacrificed for Christ the traditions of the Carolingian and Ottonian political thought as well as the interests of the German kingdom. This also brought him into conflict with some ecclesiastical circles in Saxony and elsewhere.

Yet despite the attempts to reformulate the objectives of his reign, no relief came. The emperor lived in the world, was a great monarch and the concept of *Renovatio Imperii Romanorum* by no means reduced the Empire to a modest size, but, on the contrary, brought even greater earthly glory to it. That is why Otto III was constantly convinced of his sinfulness. Severe penitential practices seemed to be a solution to the problem. At some point he decided to resolve the dilemma by renouncing his throne. Political failures might have been the final straw. Affected by them, he came to the conclusion that he was too sinful to see the renewal of the Roman Empire through.

I would like to be well understood here. When writing about Otto III's internal dilemma, I do not mean a conflict between being an emperor and the depth of the monarch's religious involvement,[325] because such a contradiction was not necessarily there.[326] The inevitability of this conflict was completely unknown to Ottonian historiographers or to Cluniac authors. It was experienced by neither Otto I nor Henry II, both of whom treated their royal duties and their Christian vocation very seriously. The crux of the matter

[325]　Such a contradiction was sometimes assumed by the older literature on the subject, see e.g. Albert Hauck, *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands*, 7th ed., vol. 3 (Berlin and Leipzig: Akademie-Verlag, 1954), 257–258.

[326]　See Ter Braak, *Kaiser Otto III*., especially 208–238; Uhlirz, *Otto III*, 412–413.

was not that Otto III deeply experienced his faith, but that he was influenced by a strand of spirituality that had a pessimistic view of the world.

In my analysis I stress the differences in worldviews between the imperial Church and the eremitic circles. It must be noted, however, that in the early 11th century the religious atmosphere of the German *Reichkirche*, hitherto imbued with a certain kind of optimism, began to grow darker. This was the time preceding the Gregorian Reform, characterized by profound spiritual anxiety.[327] This is evidenced by works of Thietmar and Adalbold, who regarded the king's sinfulness as an important problem in the reconstruction of history. A highly significant testimony is also provided by the work of Henry II.[328]

Worried by the faithful's disregard for canon law, he demanded that bishops put an end to all irregularities and tried to make canon law itself more severe. He was afraid that his subjects' sinfulness would bring God's punishment upon the kingdom. On the other hand, he put a lot of effort into ensuring for himself protection of saints and intercession prayers by as many individuals and spiritual corporations as possible. He was of the same generation as Otto III, so he experienced similar anxieties. However, they were not as deep, so he never sought close relations with anchorites, he did not think about monastic profession or about martyrdom, and when devoting himself to mortification to an extent greater than provided for in canon law, he nevertheless did it in moderation. We know, for example, that he did not eat meat during Septuagesima.[329] He was an ardent supporter of a reform of the Church, but at the same time he pursued a religious policy that would not be detrimental to the interests of the kingdom. Bruno of Querfurt did not manage to persuade Henry to evangelize the Lutici.

Drawing a parallel between Otto III and Henry II is a highly instructive exercise.[330] On the one hand, we can see that the former was a child of his generation. On the other, we learn again that being part of that generation does not entirely explain the emperor's ideology and personality.

---

327   Leyser, "On the Eve of the First European Revolution," passim.

328   Hoffmann, *Mönchskönig*, 50–60 and passim; my point of view in Michałowski, "The Nine-Week Lent", 35–36.

329   Michałowski, "The Nine-Week Lent", 31.

330   Such comparisons, on a much larger scale, are often successfully drawn in the modern literature on the subject; see e.g. *Otto III.—Heinrich II. eine Wende?*, passim; Strzelczyk, *Otton III*, 192–222.

5   Summing Up

Obviously, the present reconstruction of Otto III's political thought is only a hypothesis. No medieval author explained the motives behind the monarch's conduct. We can give two arguments in favour of the concept presented here. Firstly, it explains the coincidence of several seemingly unconnected facts: the unusually strong development of the ideology of Imperial renewal, unprecedented emphasis on the religious nature of the imperial dignity and the monarch's proclivity, also beyond the accepted custom, for living in penance and mortification. Secondly, in the light of this hypothesis it becomes clear why the *Renovatio Imperii Romanorum* ideology was formulated shortly after St. Adalbert's death. My concept assumes that the essence of the emperor's ideology and policy was religious. It is, therefore, not surprising that the stimulus may have come from the martyrdom of the Apostle of the Prussians.

This does not mean that Otto III's personality was suddenly changed as a result of his friend's death. There is no doubt that the monarch had been interested in extreme forms of asceticism even before that. This is evidenced by the veneration for St. Alexius—a symbol of living in complete poverty and abasement.[331] Immediately after the imperial coronation on 21 May 996, the ruler offered his coronation mantle to the saint.[332] We also know that his fascination with Aachen went back at least to the same year, if in February the following year the pope granted a privilege for the local palace chapel instituting cardinal-led liturgy. Nevertheless, St. Adalbert's martyrdom contributed to the crystallization of the monarch's political views.

Scholars writing about the subject point to various sources of inspiration that influenced or were supposed to have influenced Otto III's political thought. Percy Ernst Schramm's thesis stressing the importance of his

---

[331] Aleksander Gieysztor, "Dobrowolne ubóstwo, ucieczka od świata i średniowieczny kult św. Aleksego," in *Polska w świecie*, 21–40; Karl Ferdinand Werner, "La Légende de s. Alexis: un document sur la religion de la haute noblesse vers l'an Mil," in *Haut Moyen-Age, culture, éducation et société. Etudes offertes à Pierre Riché* (Nanterre: Editions Publidix, 1990), 531–546.

[332] *Ex Miraculis sancti Alexii*, ed. Georg Heinrich Pertz, MGH SS, vol. 4, cap. 3, 619–620; see Uhlirz, *Otto III.*, 206; Johannes Laudage, "Zur Kaiserkrönung Ottos III.," *Geschichte in Köln* 6 (1976): 16–17. The *Miracles of St. Alexius* does not inform us when the gift was presented. It should be assumed, however, that it was right after the coronation. It is very unlikely that this happened during the emperor's subsequent visits to the Eternal City, because by that time Otto III became fascinated with the cult of St. Adalbert and would have given his imperial insignia to him.

fascination with Antiquity still remains valid. The scholar was well aware of how important religion had been for the emperor. He did not deny that it, too, had influenced the monarch's policy. Still, he looked for a solution to the mystery of *Renovatio Imperii Romanorum* in a nostalgia for the greatness of the ancient world. Schramm's interpretation is firmly rejected by Knut Görich. For him, religion was the only stimulus that prompted Otto III to implement his *Renovatio* programme, which, very narrow in its scope, came down to a religious proposal: ensuring that the papacy would be able to work. A radically different position is that of Przemysław Urbańczyk. In his view the emperor was motivated by his rivalry with the Byzantine Empire, with all the monarch's gestures and actions referring to Christianity being only instances of social engineering at work.[333]

I agree with Knut Görich only to the extent that I, too, see the main source of inspiration in religion. This does not mean that I ignore the significance of the ancient legacy. Without it, the *Renovatio Imperii Romanorum* programme would have been ultimately impossible. I would gladly go a step further and suggest

---

[333] P. Urbańczyk, "Zjazd Gnieźnieński w polityce," in *Trakt cesarski*, 49–90. On p. 68 the scholar writes: "It seems to me that his [i.e. Otto III's] interest in the religious sphere, both in its spiritual and institutional aspects, could be regarded as part of a great political concept; that it was not a mystical inclination, but, rather, political rationalism and the pragmatism of social engineering that enabled him to realize the benefits that could be had from manipulations of the religious sphere." ("Wydaje mi się, że jego [tzn. Ottona III] zainteresowanie sferą religijną zarówno w jego aspektach duchowych, jak i instytucjonalnych można uznać za część wielkiej koncepcji politycznej; że to nie skłonności mistyczne, lecz raczej racjonalizm polityczny i pragmatyka socjotechniczna pozwoliła mu dostrzec zyski, jakie mogły mu przynieść manipulacje sferą religijną".) It is impossible to agree with such a view. Otto III's religious practices required great fortitude and were physically exhausting. Therefore, it would be difficult to imagine that the emperor was so determined to put his own health or even life at risk only for the purposes of a political hoax. There is another reason that makes this idea hard to believe. This kind of manipulation was pointless; moreover, it was politically dangerous, because the ruler put himself at risk of being accused of neglecting his royal duties by devoting himself to spiritual life (*Vita Quinque Fratrum*, cap. 7, 47, v. 8). Just as risky were his experiments with titles. Members of the elite circles of power might have found it worrying and disconcerting that their emperor refers to himself in official documents as a servant of the Apostles or servant of Jesus Christ. At best, this might have sounded odd. And certainly in no way did it enhance the emperor's authority. Even more risky was his public pledge to enter a monastery. In the future his enemies could remind him of it and demand abdication.

There is no denying that Otto III may have been motivated by purely secular ambitions as well. However, I cannot agree to religious motives being disregarded; in addition, I believe that they were the crux of the matter.

that Otto III's fascination with ancient culture made him even more eager to implement the idea of a renewal of the Empire. If we look at the problem in question from this point of view, it will turn out that a complete biography of Otto III would require taking into account a substantial Byzantine context.[334] At the same time a question would have to be asked about the impact of his Greek mother on the monarch's intellectual and spiritual formation. This is not necessary for the purpose of the present analysis, however. The monarch's political thought and religious sensibility can largely be explained by means of a reference to the Latin civilization.

---

334   See Małgorzata Dąbrowska, "'On—królestw wszystkich władca'. Zawrotna kariera Ottona I i jej bizantyński kontekst", in *Pokłosie Zjazdu Gnieźnieńskiego. O początkach kościoła w Łęczycy*, Towarzystwo Miłośników Ziemi Łęczyckiej w Łęczycy (Łęczyca: Towarzystwo Naukowe Płockie. Oddział w Łęczycy, 2002), 9–17.

Conclusion

When in 966 Mieszko I accepted the Christian religion, it was clear that an ecclesiastical organization would soon be established in his state. The erection of one or more bishoprics in Poland must have already been planned at that time. In addition, there emerged a need to subordinate the Polish church organization to a metropolitan archbishop. Looking from the perspective of one thousand years, we know that this metropolitan see was established in the Piast state.

However, it is doubtful whether this was obvious during Jordan's pontificate or even during the first part Unger's pontificate. Another solution suggested itself at least just as strongly—Poland could be subordinated to the jurisdiction of a foreign archbishop. During the reign of Otto I the authority of the German metropolitans was extended not only to Polabia, which was being conquered at the time, but also to newly established Danish bishoprics, despite the fact that Denmark's dependence on the Empire was rather loose. Otto II followed suit and incorporated newly established Bohemian dioceses into the Mainz church province. Both rulers acted in accordance with a doctrine, formulated in Carolingian times, whereby missionary countries should permanently be subordinated to archbishops who had their sees in Frankish cities.

We do not know what the imperial plans were with regard to Poznań; nor do we know whether and to what extent they differed from the plans made in the Roman Curia. However, we would be justified in suspecting that in imperial circles the founding of a Polish church province was deemed disadvantageous. Subordination of Polish dioceses to this or that German archbishopric would have provided possibilities for putting pressure on the Piast state. Of course, the degree of dependence stemming from metropolitan subordination should not be overestimated. Neither, however, should it be played down. The right to ordain bishops and summon Polish bishops to provincial synods would have provided an excellent opportunity for interference.

The imperial court may have had other considerations in mind as well. A monarchy with its own archbishop enhanced its prestige; it grew in stature.[1] In addition, it had more room for manoeuvre, at least in one narrow respect: its ruler could crown himself king without looking for a foreign metropolitan to consecrate him. It is doubtful whether the German ruler was willing to allow a tributary of his to enhance his authority so much and obtain such a dangerous instrument.

---

1   Haiger, "Königtum und Kirchenorganisation," passim.

However, in the Empire church policy was determined not only by the king but also by the episcopate. German archbishops had no reason to be in favour of the founding of a Polish province. On the contrary, its establishment would mean a curtailing of the ambitions of German frontier provinces. This was not only about the fact that Magdeburg and Mainz would not be able to expand territorially, but also about the fact that they would not be able to evangelize the pagans. And the *missio ad gentes* was a very important element of ecclesiastical and political thinking in the Ottonian period. We can say very little about the opposition to the Gniezno project among the German archbishops. However, that there was such opposition is certain.

The founding of a church province with its metropolitan see in Poland was hindered by another factor as well. In the early Middle Ages a popular opinion was that a high status in the hierarchy should be accorded to local Churches with their sees in Roman *civitates* and their roots in the Apostolic times. It was clear to everybody that no town in the Piast state met these requirements. Thus, it might have seemed that a better solution would be to make the Polish lands subordinated to some ancient archbishopric situated in the Empire's heartland or even to the Archbishopric of Magdeburg, for although it had been fairly recently established, a papal decision had made it equal to the oldest Churches.

What could also be regarded as somewhat problematic was the fact that the territorial base for the Polish church province was too narrow and insufficiently stable. Mieszko I's state within its 966 borders was too small for this part of Europe to accommodate an archbishopric with at least three suffragan bishoprics. It is true that the Piast state was rapidly expanding its territory, yet even from the perspective of the year 1000 it was not certain whether and to what extent the latest acquisitions were permanent. After all, the incorporation of Silesia must be dated to 990, and the incorporation of Cracow happened only slightly earlier or, formally, even later, according to some hypotheses. This situation must have disconcerted the ecclesiastical circles, which might even have seriously considered the creation of a Polish province, because they did not know how to define the borders of the planned province.

Yet in spite of all these difficulties the Archbishopric of Gniezno was eventually established. Two factors were instrumental in this: St. Adalbert's martyrdom during his mission and Otto III's personality.

In the early Middle Ages it was commonly believed that the granting of metropolitan status to a local Church was justified by the evangelization of pagans by its bishops, especially if it had taken place at the very beginning of the history of the Church in question. St. Adalbert, too, went on a mission; moreover, by dying a martyr's death, he made his mission eternal. Unlike St. Eucharius

or St. Martial, he had not been the bishop of the diocese to the establishment of which he contributed. But he could bequeath his merits to this diocese, by virtue of the fact that he was buried in its cathedral. The Archbishopric of Gniezno benefited from the fruit of the work and death of its patron in another respect as well. Adalbert was accompanied on his mission by his brother, the future metropolitan archbishop. Thus, although it is true that the martyr never personally took possession of the Gniezno see, another man who took part in his mission and who witnessed his martyrdom did. In addition, those who had participated in the mission included, in a way, Bolesław Chrobry, because he had granted his protection to the missionary, had sent him to Prussia and then with great veneration brought the holy remains to Poland. Also thanks to this, Poland and, consequently, its Church had a share, as it were, in the merits of the Bishop of Prague.

We do not know whether all these arguments were taken into consideration by those who took the decision to establish the Archbishopric of Gniezno. On the other hand, there is no doubt that they understood the essence of these arguments, if they saw a direct connection between St. Adalbert and the archbishopric. That they did see such a connection is evidenced primarily by Gaudentius's title of *Archiepiscopus sancti Adalberti* as well as the fact that on the wellhead from Isola Tiberina the missionary of the Prussians is depicted wearing the pallium. We would, therefore, have to agree that the ideological foundation of the Polish archbishopric was its missionary nature revealed in its patron saint.

No scholar should disregard such premises. Someone might be satisfied with the statement that the founding of a church province in Poland having its metropolitan see in Poland simply suggested itself for organizational reasons. The archbishop would be available locally, it would be easier for him to work with his suffragan bishops, he would better understand the specificity of the local situation. We can easily list several other purely pragmatic arguments.

Yet they were by no means sufficient, for they did not answer all the questions that troubled people in the early Middle Ages in such cases. What was extremely important in their eyes were the means of sanctification that a metropolitan see should ensure for the faithful, and they were not content with the fact that the metropolitan would be anointed archbishop and would receive the pallium. They looked for additional guarantees. In this case they found them in the person of Adalbert, in his work and martyrdom. Looking at the saint, they became convinced that he imparted the missionary nature, so important to any archbishopric, to Gniezno, where he was laid to rest.

At Otto III's court the arguments supporting the establishment of a Polish church province became even sharper, for St. Adalbert was considered there

to have been an apostle. What may have been behind this was an attempt to undermine the significance of the fact that the Gniezno Archbishopric had not been established in the early days of the Church. True—as the argument would have been in this case—that this archbishopric does not go back to the times of St. Peter or St. Clement, but since St. Adalbert is an apostle, the local Church erected on his tomb is apostolic.

The establishment of the Polish church province required a political decision as well. Bolesław Chrobry was undoubtedly extremely interested in such a decision being made. He must have realized that having his own archbishop, he would enjoy greater authority as a ruler and have more freedom in political and church matters. However, when it came to establishing the province, he lacked the necessary legal instruments with the exception of one: he could submit a request. The right to establish an archbishopric was the formal prerogative of the Holy See. In the early Middle Ages it usually supported the emancipation of local Churches. A classic example here is the support provided by Rome to the Solun brothers. Therefore, we have reasons to believe that in the case of Poland, too, the papacy was in general disposed favourably. However, in Ottonian times it was by no means independent, definitely not during Sylvester II's pontificate, when Otto III resided in Rome. That is why the fate of the Polish Church was, in fact, in the hands of the emperor.

We need to be aware of the fact that by agreeing to an archbishopric being established in Gniezno, the monarch abandoned the two-hundred-year-old policy of his predecessors, both the Carolingians and the Ottonians. In addition, he jeopardized the traditional interests of the German kingdom. We need, therefore, to answer the question about the rationale behind the emperor's actions.

We can look for it in the doctrine that the emperor formulated for his own use. Its essence lay in concentrating political efforts on religious tasks, which was manifested in unprecedented titles from the last two years of Otto III's rule, titles that stressed the religious nature of the imperial office. Given such a definition of the objectives of the monarch's reign, it was easier to leave aside the interests of the German kingdom, when the interest of the Church demanded it. It was in any case obvious that the establishment of a Polish church province, that is, with its metropolitan see in Poland, would meet very real pastoral needs.

This does not mean that there was no place in Otto III's doctrine for actions aimed at strengthening the Holy Roman Empire. On the contrary, the motto *Renovatio Imperii Romanorum* was no empty slogan, but reflected specific intentions, which are, however, difficult to reconstruct in detail. Nevertheless, I am inclined to think that when he took up the idea of renovating the

Empire, the monarch was guided primarily by religious considerations. Well-known historical examples, especially those of Constantine the Great and Charlemagne, showed that a growth of the Empire was a prerequisite for the growth of Christianity, and that only an emperor at the height of earthly glory could effectively help in the renewal of the Church.

In the early Middle Ages no emperor would as a rule disregard the duty to support the Church and Christianity; some emperors rendered great service in this field. What made Otto III stand out, however, was the fact that he stressed this aspect of imperial vocation more strongly than others did. It seems that the reason behind this was a unique way of experiencing religion, characteristic of the young monarch.

In the second half of the 10th century the tone in the Ottonian Empire was set by a kind of spirituality that taught people to look at the world with a degree of optimism. Even the most pious of them trusted the social elites as well as individuals who held important secular or ecclesiastical offices. The king was regarded as a vicar of Christ, with some claiming that he was an image of Christ. What could clearly be seen in this attitude was the conviction that although life in the world was not free from danger, the earthly world did not corrupt human beings. If Otto III, like many of his contemporaries, had given in unreservedly to this atmosphere, he would have probably become convinced that he would achieve eternal salvation, if he diligently fulfilled all his duties as a ruler. But the emperor was also influenced by another strand of spirituality which flourished in Italy at the turn of the 11th century. It taught people to be distrustful of the world, which it perceived as a source of corruption of man. Influenced by these two opposing tendencies, Otto III's personality was broken, as it were. On the one hand, he tried to fulfil his imperial duties, but on the other, he could not shake off the conviction that he was seeking not God's but his own glory. In order to resolve this dilemma, he decided to be more unequivocal than his predecessors in focusing on religious and ecclesiastical tasks, excluding earthly matters and interests. This resulted, among other things, in the decision to establish an archbishopric in Gniezno.

When trying to understand Otto III's policy and, more broadly, his personality, we need to bear in mind the role played in all this by the death of St. Adalbert. The matter should be analyzed on several levels. First, let us recall that the martyrdom of the Bishop of Prague contributed ultimately to the crystallization of the emperor's political programme—which was at the same time a religious programme—namely the idea of renewal of the Empire. The example of religious sacrifice must have played a role here, but there was another important factor. The monarch regarded the martyrdom of his

friend as a manifestation and cause of God's grace for him and his reign. This most likely prompted him to undertake ambitious, large-scale projects. But St. Adalbert's martyrdom during his mission was also an indication as to the direction in which these projects should go. Hence, it seems, such a great emphasis on the evangelization of the pagans in the *Renovatio Imperii Romanorum* concept, and, consequently, the founding of a Polish archbishopric, as well as the emperor's favourable attitude to St. Stephen's calls for the founding of a Hungarian church province.

The Gniezno foundation was at once a gift for the martyr, a tribute and an attempt to ensure constant intercession of the Apostle of the Prussians. In this context a special emphasis should be placed on the relic deposition ceremony, performed by the emperor himself. By taking the martyr's venerable remains in his hands, the monarch followed a rite virtually forgotten as a royal act in the eastern part of the Frankish world. Otto III was convinced he was a great sinner, which is why he felt a greater need than his predecessors to obtain the intercession of saints, also in state matters. This was the reason why he personally carried the relics to their final resting place in Gniezno, and why the cult of St. Adalbert was so important to him.

The aim of the present book is to reconstruct the religious factors that were instrumental in the creation of the Polish church province. We know that there were several such factors: development of Christianity in Poland, St. Adalbert's martyrdom, Otto III's personality, emergence of a pessimistic strand in European spirituality. One of these factors stemmed from the very nature of the situation: it was only a matter of time before a large country accepting Christianity would receive its own metropolitan organization. However, the problem was whether this would be a matter of decades or centuries. The other factors were more circumstantial and St. Adalbert's martyrdom was pure chance. With all these factors coinciding, the Polish province was established as early as the year 1000.

By stressing the fact that in his policies—including his Polish policy—the emperor was motivated by religious considerations, I do not mean to say that I disregard other factors. Otto III was undoubtedly fascinated with Antiquity, and the spirit of rivalry with the Byzantine Empire can clearly be seen in Gerbert of Aurillac's writings. Thus, when planning his *Renovatio Imperii Romanorum*, the monarch may have found additional motivation in purely secular ambitions. Yet I am deeply convinced that the key to the "puzzle" of Otto III is his religiosity.

However, regardless of whether the concept of Imperial renewal was motivated only by religious considerations or whether some role was also played by

secular considerations and ambitions, there is no doubt that the monarch operated under the existing balance of power. A revival of the Empire was a political undertaking, which is why Otto III must have wondered to what extent he could rely on his own human and material resources, and must have asked himself whether or not he should obtain some allies for his plans. This question suggested itself all the more emphatically given the fact that his grandfather's and father's policy, their method of building the Empire, had failed. They had not been able to subjugate the Polabian Slavs, and it was possible to defuse the situation at the north-eastern frontier of the Empire only thanks to the emperor's Polish ally. That is why the alliance with Bolesław Chrobry and its terms should be viewed not only with regard to religious convictions. We are dealing here with a reformulation of thinking about the state, dictated by a specific kind of *realpolitik*.[2] One of the effects of this new way of thinking was the founding of the Archbishopric of Gniezno.

The situation changed with Otto III's death. Henry II did not share his predecessor's political principles;[3] as a result, instead of maintaining an alliance with Bolesław Chrobry, he constantly waged war against him. In the summing up of Chapter III, I have pointed out that the new ruler also had a different religious sensibility than the last of the Ottos. Yet the Archbishopric of Gniezno survived. While Magdeburg took some steps to undermine the existence of the Polish province, Henry did nothing of the sort. In any case, there are no traces of such actions in the surviving sources. Henry's attitude stemmed from two related factors. An attack on the Polish province would have been an attack also on the work of Otto III and St. Adalbert. And the monarch, wanting to convince his subjects he was their rightful king, stressed on every possible occasion that he held his predecessor and his legacy in the highest esteem.[4] That is why he did not abolish Otto's foundations but supported and protected them. This was the case of St. Adalbert's Collegiate Church in Aachen. Unfinished by the deceased emperor, it survived because the new king took care of it. Can we image Henry II attacking the Gniezno foundation in these circumstances?

There is no doubt that under the new monarch the Apostle of the Prussians was not venerated as much as he had been before. His time had passed. But Henry II had no intention whatsoever to despise St. Adalbert. On the contrary,

---

2   Třeštík, "Von Svatopulk zu Bolesław Chrobry," 143.

3   See Strzelczyk, *Otton III*, 192–222.

4   Michael Borgolte, "Die Stiftungsurkunden Heinrichs II. Eine Studie zum Handlungsspielraum des letzten Liudolflngers", in *Festschrift für Eduard Hlawitschka zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. Roland Pauler and Karl Rudolf Schnith, Münchener Historische Studien. Abteilung Mittelalterliche Geschichte 5 (Kallmünz/Opf.: Lassleben, 1993, 231–250.

he dedicated to him one of the altars in the Bamberg Cathedral, the construction of which had cost him a lot in terms of finances and effort. There was room in it for relics of the Apostle of the Prussians.[5] Obviously, the monarch could not attack the archbishopric of St. Adalbert, whom he regarded as his patron, even if only a minor one.

---

5   K.-J. Benz, *Untersuchungen zur politischen Bedeutung*, p. 140 and fn. 7 on p. 124. Signs of veneration for St. Adalbert left by Henry ii suggest that the wellhead from Isola Tiberina may have been founded by that monarch and that the ruler depicted in it may be Henry himself.

Afterword to the English Edition

The present book was written in 2003, so it takes into account the literature on the subject published up to 2002. Later studies are used in exceptional cases. Eleven years have passed since the publication. Since then new editions of sources which I refer to in the book have been published, as have many works dealing with the issues discussed in it. It is impossible for me to express my opinion on them in the present edition. This would mean writing the book anew. In any case, I do not think that the more recent research has been modified by views on the essential matters. On the other hand, I would like to point to some important critical opinions concerning the Polish edition of my book.

Gerard Labuda (1916–2010) commented on the book in some detail.[1] This outstanding historian was the greatest expert on issues relating to the Gniezno Summit. He had some reservations about some of my theses. Let me respond to the most important of them. Labuda did not agree with my suggestion that the donation to St. Peter known from a document called *Dagome iudex* could have been made to clear the way for the founding of a Polish church province. The scholar's arguments are as follows: firstly, the document in question suggests that the objective of the donation was to ensure inheritance for Mieszko I's sons from his second marriage; secondly, around 990, when the document was issued, the prince had problems with filling the post of the head of the only Polish bishopric existing at the time. Could he have been thinking about creating a province in such circumstances then?[2] My response would be as follows. It is highly likely that the ruler wanted to safeguard his younger sons' inheritance, but this does not mean that he did not have other considerations in mind when making the donation. Secondly, Mieszko I was a ruler with broad horizons. He managed to obtain for his country a bishop not subordinated to a foreign metropolitan. He must have realized that lasting independence could be ensured for the Polish Church only by a Polish province and he must have sought to establish it. What I do not hide in the Polish edition of the book and what I would like to stress once again is the fact that the thesis concerning the existence of a link between the donation and Mieszko's ecclesiastical plans is for me only a conjecture, difficult to prove unequivocally, but the argument

---

1   Gerard Labuda, "Zjazd i synod gnieźnieński roku 1000 w nowym oświetleniu historiograficznym," in *Cognitioni gestorum. Studia z dziejów średniowiecza dedykowane Profesorowi Jerzemu Strzelczykowi*, ed. Dariusz Andrzej Sikorski and Andrzej Marek Wyrwa (Poznań and Warsaw: Wydawnictwo DiG, 2006), 163–184.

2   Ibid., 166–167.

from the *Life of Methodius* I have quoted is—though not decisive—significant. However, the Poznań historian did not comment on that argument.

In his article G. Labuda devotes much attention to a reconstruction of events associated with the founding of the Archbishopric of Gniezno. The difference of opinion in this respect between the eminent scholar and myself is slight. Labuda used *Annales Hildesheimenses minores* and Comas' *Chronicle* as his source base to a greater extent than I did.[3] Indeed, referring to Cosmas, for example, it is very easy to demonstrate that Gaudentius was already nominated Archbishop of Gniezno in 999, that is, before the Summit of Gniezno. Were I to accept the information provided by the Bohemian historiographer as reliable, I would not need all that complex analysis of the title *achiepiscopus sancti Adalbert* to prove the same thesis. However, the problem is that I am not entirely sure how well-informed Comas was. He probably used an earlier source—and here I would agree with Labuda—but the question is whether he did or did not amplify that source. In addition, I would be more careful in using *Annales Hildesheimenses minores.* Can an annalist who writes that the archbishopric was established in Prague—while we know it was established in Gniezno—be regarded as reliable? Although Labuda believes that we can separate true information from false information in the source in question, I think we are treading on uncertain ground here.

Continuing with my analysis of the Gniezno Summit, G. Labuda disagrees with my interpretation of the Meissen document of 995 according to which Otto III claimed the right to define the boundaries of dioceses in Poland. Labuda points out that the expansion of the territory of the Bishopric of Meissen to include Silesia was at the expense of the Diocese of Prague, that is, a Bohemian diocese, and Bohemia, unlike Poland, was dependent on Germany.[4] I do not find his argumentation entirely convincing. On the one hand, at that time Silesia was within the borders of Poland, but on the other, Poland's ruler was a tributary of the emperor.

G. Labuda disagrees with me when I say that the Archbishop of Magdeburg Gisiler was against the founding of the Archbishopric of Gniezno.[5] I have to admit the author's argument[6] is not clear to me. It is focused on the Magdeburg concept (P*apsturkunden* †412), while my reconstruction of Gisiler's attitude is based on the forgery *Papsturkunden* †191.

---

3   Ibid., 167–180.

4   Ibid., 174–175.

5   Ibid., 178.

6   Ibid., 175–179.

There are two other disputed points worth mentioning here. In my book I argue that Otto III was plagued by a "general" sense of sinfulness. This general feeling, and not some specific sin, prompted the emperor constantly to engage in penitential devotions and even suggested abandoning the throne and entering a monastery. G. Labuda disagrees and claims that this was a very specific sin, namely sexual impurity, which led to a venereal disease—the cause of the emperor's death.[7] And this sin or, to be more precise, the need to atone for it, was the reason behind the emperor's Gniezno pilgrimage. The essence of the dispute comes down to the question about the causes of the monarch's piety, which had political implications: transformations of spirituality taking place in the Church at the turn of the millennia or the weakness of Otto III's character. I insist on the former, as I argue in the book. Sins of impurity, so common after all, although harshly judged, would not have been able to cause a crisis of the monarch's personality, if it had not been for the moral pessimism that affected some of the imperial elites around 1000.

G. Labuda also accuses me of underestimating the role of Sylvester II and overestimating that of Otto III in the founding of the Archbishopric of Gniezno. Remarks concerning this are spread throughout the article. The position of Labuda himself on this issue is not entirely clear to me. Thus, let me specify mine. It is obvious that the archbishopric would not have been erected without the pope's collaboration. However, I believe that without the emperor's consent the province would not have been established either for political reasons; if the monarch had not wanted to allow a Polish church province to be created, he would not have allowed it. Let me go even further: it was above all Otto III who was interested in the founding of the Archbishopric of Gniezno. It was to be a tribute to St. Adalbert and we know very well how greatly the emperor venerated that martyr. On the other hand, we know nothing about any special affection for St. Adalbert on Sylvester II's part. We cannot even be sure if a papal canonization of the martyr took place.

My book was also reviewed in detail by Dariusz Andrzej Sikorski.[8] I responded to his criticism in the same journal,[9] which was met with the

---

7   Ibid., 179–184.

8   Dariusz Andrzej Sikorski, "Zjazd Gnieźnieński widziany z perspektywy dziejów powszechnych," *Kwartalnik Historyczny* 112 (2005), no. 3: 135–160.

9   Roman Michałowski, "Jeszcze raz o religijnych przesłankach powstania arcybiskupstwa gnieźnieńskiego. Odpowiedź Recenzentowi," *Kwartalnik Historyczny* 112 (2005), no. 4: 93–115.

reviewer's rejoinder.[10] The discussion is continued in a book, published by the scholar a few years later, in which the author analyzes the Summit of Gniezno in great detail and presents his opinion on some of my theses. D. A. Sikorski and I disagree on many points, a fact evidenced by the length of the polemic published in *Kwartalnik Historyczny*. Here I would like to refer to just two related issues, which are of prime importance to the concept presented in my book.

Citing the literature on the subject, I conclude that the title *servus Iesu Christi*, which came from Apostolic letters and which Otto III used during his Gniezno pilgrimage, was an expression of his conviction that he was travelling to Poland as an apostle. My adversary attacks the value of this title as evidence.[11] He claims that it was used by only one notary, described by contemporary scholars as Her. C, who did not do it systematically at that. Why was he the only one? In addition, if this title were to be indeed linked to the journey to Gniezno, why was it continued to be used in Germany after the emperor's return from Poland? And why was it not used permanently?

Let me begin with the following observation. The title in question appeared for the first time on 17 January 1000, in the first known document issued by the emperor in Germany on his way from Italy to Gniezno. Why then? Probably because after crossing the Italian border Otto III decided he had begun his pilgrimage to St. Adalbert's tomb. However, the pilgrimage did not end in Gniezno; there was also the return journey, which is why the title was also used in Germany. How often was it used? In order to answer this question, we should refer only to dated and original documents. Chronological attribution of undated documents is perforce hypothetical, while the necessity of using only original documents stems the fact that copyists may have changed the text whenever they encountered expressions they could not understand, i.e. the analyzed title which seemed to be a mistake. As we look through dated originals, it turns out that there are six diplomas originating between 17 January (the first imperial document issued after the crossing of the German border) and 1 May 1000 (arrival in Aachen) among which only one does not contain the term *servus Iesu Christi*. The conclusion is as follows: in that period the imperial chancellery regarded the title in question as the most suitable.

---

10   Dariusz Andrzej Sikorski, "O zastosowaniu analogii powszechnodziejowych dla spraw polskich—replika na odpowiedź Romana Michałowskiego," *Kwartalnik Historyczny* 113 (2006), no. 2: 133–150.

11   Dariusz Andrzej Sikorski, *Kościół w Polsce za Mieszka I i Bolesława Chrobrego. Rozważania nad granicami poznania historycznego* (Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM, 2011), 453–454.

In subsequent months it was used less systematically, probably because it was not clear at what point the Gniezno pilgrimage ended. The last such document was issued in Pavia on 6 July 1000; after that date the title *servus Iesu Christi* disappeared completely, for it was obvious that the pilgrimage to the tomb of St. Adalbert had been completed.

I do not know why only the notary known as Her. C used that title. However, it would be difficult to accept that the scribe used the expression *servus Iesu Christi* on his own, without the emperor's permission. After all, the title was unusual—not to say, odd—and no scribe working in the chancellery would have dared to use it on his own initiative. On the other hand, in making this choice Otto III must have been guided by the meaning the expression carried. And the only meaning that suggests itself was the role of apostle performed by the emperor during the pilgrimage to Gniezno. This is a hypothetical interpretation, but it does explain the extraordinary imperial title. One thing is beyond doubt in any case. We cannot say that the title *servus Iesu Christi* appeared in diplomas by chance, without any connection to the political thought, as Sikorski seems to be suggesting. We would have to assume that rulers did not care what titles they used in official documents. However, such an assumption would be entirely false.

In addition, my conclusion is—following earlier studies as well—that the title of imperial brother and associate, which, according to Gallus Anonymus, was given to Bolesław Chrobry during the Summit of Gniezno, drew on the mode used by St. Paul to describe Epaphroditus in his Letter to the Ephesians. D. A. Sikorski rejects that conclusion as well.[12] He says that this expression appeared sometimes in medieval texts, too, also in Gallus' times, so there is no need to link it to the Letter to the Ephesians. Yet if we conclude—and I can see no better way out—that the title *servus Iesu Christi* does draw on St. Paul's letters and his apostolicity, the title "imperial brother and associate" should be interpreted in the light of these letters: for Otto III Bolesław Chrobry was like Epaphroditus for St. Paul. Gallus may not have been aware of that connection, because it was probably not explained in the text which the chronicler used. But I am not interested in the views of this 12th-century author, but in the events of the year 1000. Obviously, we should ask whether Gallus had at his disposal an account of the Gniezno Summit from Bolesław Chrobry's times. Sikorski says he did not. I think he did. However, given the current state of affairs, this is a matter for a separate and extensive analysis.

---

12   Ibid., pp. 452–460.

Bibliography

List of Primary Sources

Ademari Cabannensis Chronicon. Edited by Pascale Bourgain. Corpus Christianorum: Continuatio mediaevalis 129. Turnhout: Brepols, 1999.

Ademari epistola de Apostolatu sancti Martialis. PL 141, cols. 87–112.

Admonitio generalis. In *Capitularia regum Francorum*. Vol. 1, edited by Alfred Boretius. MGH. Legum sectio 2, Capitularia regum Francorum 1, no. 22, 52–62. Hannoverae: Hahn, 1883.

Adso Dervensis. *De ortu et tempore Antichristi necnon tractatus, qui ab eo dependunt.* Edited by Daniel Verhelst. Corpus Christianorum: Continuatio mediaevalis 45. Turnholt: Brepols, 1976.

Agnelli qui et Andreas Liber pontificalis Ecclesiae Ravennatis. MGH SS rerum Langobardicarum et Italicarum saec. VI–IX, 265–391. Hannoverae: Hahn, 1878.

Anastasii Bibliothecarii Epistolae sive praefationes. Edited by Ernst Perels and Gerhard Laehr. MGH Epistolae 7. Epistolae aevi Karolini 5. Berolini: Weidmann, 1928, s. 395–442.

Annales ex annalibus Iuvavensibus antiquis excerpti. Edited by Harry Bresslau. MGH SS 30.2, 732–744. Lipsiae: Hahn, 1934.

Annales Hildesheimenses. Edited by Georg Waitz. MGH SS rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum 8. Hannoverae: Hahn, 1878.

Annales Quedlinburgenses. Edited by Georg Heinrich Pertz. MGH SS 3, 22–90. Hannoverae: Hahn, 1839.

Annales regni Francorum. Edited by Friedrich Kurze. MGH SS rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum. Hannoverae: Hahn, 1895.

Cantica Medii Aevi Polono-Latina. Vol. 1, *Sequentiae*. Edited by Henryk Kowalewicz, no. 1, 13–14. Varsoviae: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1964.

Chronicon Novaliciense. Edited by Gian Carlo Alessio. Torino: Einaudi, 1982.

Codex diplomaticus et epistolaris Slovaciae. Vol. 1, edited by Richard Marsina. Bratislava: Slovenská akadémia vied, 1971.

Codex diplomaticus nec non epistolaris Silesiae. Vol. 1, *971–1204*. Edited by Karol Maleczyński. Wrocław: Wrocławskie Towarzystwo Miłośników Historii, 1956.

Concilia aevi Karolini. Vol. 1.1, edited by Albert Wermighoff. MGH LL, Concilia 2.1. Hannover and Leipzig: Hahn, 1906.

Concilia aevi Saxonici. Vol. 1, *916–960*. Edited by Ernst-Dieter Hehl and Horst Fuhrmann. MGH LL 4, Concilia 6.1. Hannover: Hahn, 1987.

Cosmae Pragensis Chronica Boemorum. Edited by Bertold Bretholz. MGH SS rerum Germanicarum Nova series 2. Berlin: Weidmann, 1923.

Decretales Pseudo-Isidorianae et Capitula Angilramni. Edited by Paul Hinschius. Lipsiae: Tauchnitz, 1863.

Die Conversio Bagoariorum et Carantanorum und der Brief des Erzbischofs Theotmar von Salzburg. Edited by Fritz Lošek. MGH Studien und Texte 15. Hannover: Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 1997.

Die Lebensbeschreibung der Kaiserin Adelheid von Abt Odilo von Cluny. Edited by Herbert Paulhart. Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung, Ergänzungsband 20.2. Graz-Köln: Böhlau, 1962.

Die nicht literarischen lateinischen Papiry Italiens aus der Zeit 445–700. Edited by Jan Olof Tjäder. Vol. 2. Lund-Stockholm: C.W.K. Gleerup, 1982.

Die Sachsengeschichte des Widukind non Korvei. In *Quellen zur Geschichte der sächsischen Kaiserzeit.* Edited by Albert Bauer and Reinhold Rau. Ausgewählte Quellen zur deutschen Geschichte des Mittelalters 8, 1–183. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1971.

Diplomatum regum et imperatorum Germaniae Tomi II. pars posterior. Ottonis III. diplomata. Edited by Theodor Sickel. MGH Diplomata 2.2. Hannoverae: Hahn 1893.

Diplomatum regum et imperatorum Germaniae Tomus I. Conradi I., Heinrici I. et Ottonis I diplomata. Edited by Theodor Sickel. MGH Diplomata 1. Hannoverae-Lipsiae: Hahn, 1879–1911.

E codicibus Varsaviensibus, no. 2. Edited by Wojciech Kętrzyński. MPH 5, 995–997. Lwów: W komisie księgarni Gubrunowicza i Schmidta, 1888.

Epistola Brunonis ad Henricum regem. Edited by Jadwiga Karwasińska. MPH N.S 4.3, 85–106. Warszawa: Polska Akademia Umiejętności, 1973.

Eugenii Vulgarii Sylloga. Edited by Paul von Winterfeld. MGH Poetae Latini 4.1, 412–444. Berolini: Weidmann, 1899.

Ex Miraculis sancti Alexii. Edited by Georg Heinrich Pertz. MGH SS 4, 619–620. Hannoverae: Hahn, 1841.

Ex Vita sancti Nili. Edited by Georg Heinrich Pertz. MGH SS, 4, 616–618. Hannoverae: Hahn, 1841.

Favreau, Robert. *L'épitaphe de Silvestre II à Saint-Jean-de-Latran.* In *Autour de Gerbert d'Aurillac, le pape de l'An Mil.* Edited by Olivier Guyotjeannin and Emmanuel Poulle. Matériaux pour l'Histoire publiés par l'Ecole des Chartes 1, 337–341. Paris: École des chartes, 1996.

Galli Anonymi Cronica et gesta ducum sive principum Polonorum. Edited by Karol Maleczyński. MPH Nova series 2. Cracoviae: Polska Akademia Umiejętności, 1952.

Gesta Archiepiscoporum Magdeburgensium. Edited by Wilhelm Schum. MGH SS 14, 361–486. Hannoverae: Hahn, 1883.

Gesta episcoporum Halberstadensium. Edited by Ludwig Weiland. MGH SS 23, 73–123. Hannoverae: Hahn, 1874.

Gesta principum Polonorum. Edited by Paul W. Knoll. Central European Medieval Texts 3. Budapest-New York: Central European University Press, 2003.

Gregorii episcopi Turonensis Historiarum libri decem. Vols. 1–2, edited by Rudolf Buchner. Ausgewählte Quellen zur deutschen Geschichte des Mittelalters 2. Berlin: Deutcher Verlag der Wissenschaften, 1967.

Hariulf, *Chronique de l'Abbaye de Saint-Riquier*. Edited by Ferdinand Lot. Paris: Picard, 1894.

Heirici Carmina. Edited by Ludwig Traube. MGH Poetae Latini 3, 428–517. Berolini: Weidmann, 1896.

Helgaud de Fleury, *Epitoma Vitae regis Rotberti pii*. Edited by Robert Henri Bautier and Gillette Labory. Sources d'histoire médiévale 1. Paris: Éditions du Centre national de la recherche scientifique, 1965.

Historia Brittonum cum additamentis Nennii. Edited by Theodor Mommsen. MGH Auctores Antiquissimi 13, 111–222. Berolini: Weidmann, 1898.

Historia corporis sancti Mercurii, Caesarea delati Quintodecimum, et inde Beneventum [BHL 5937]. In Edmond Martène and Ursin Durand, *Veterum scriptorum et monumentorum historicorum, dogmaticorum, moralium, amplissima collectio*. Vol. 6, cols. 751–756. Parisiis: Montalant, 1729.

Historia episcoporum Pataviensium et ducum Bavariae. Edited by Georg Waitz. MGH SS, 25, 617–622. Hannoverae: Hahn, 1880.

Historia translationis corporis S. Cornelii papae apud Compendium. PL 129, cols. 1371–1382. Parisiis 1879.

Inventio atque translatio sanctorum Abundii et Abundantii ex codice Ariananiensi descripta [BHL 18]. Edited by Mario Mastrocola. In Mario Mastrocola, *Note storiche storiche circa le diocesi di Civita C. Orte e Gallese*. Collana storica "Pian Paradiso". Studi della Chiesa nell'Alto Lazio 1, 249–252. Civita Castellana: Pian Paradisi, 1964.

Ioannis de Capella Cronica abbreviata dominorum et sanctorum abbatum sancti Richarii. Edited by Ernest Prarond. Paris: Picard, 1893.

Jean de Saint-Arnoul, *La Vie de Jean, abbé Gorze* [BHL 4396]. Edited by Michel Parisse. Paris: Picard, 1999.

Kodeks Matyldy. Księga obrzędów z kartami dedykacyjnymi. Edited by Brygida Kürbis [et al.]. Monumenta Sacra Polonorum 1. Kraków: Polska Akademia Umiejętności, 2000.

Kronika Thietmara. Edited and translated by Marian Zygmunt Jedlicki. Poznań: Instytut Zachodni, 1953.

Lamperti monachi Hersfeldensis opera. Edited by Oswad Holder-Egger. MGH SS rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum. Hannoverae-Lipsiae: Hahn, 1894.

Le pontifical Romano-Germanique du dixième siècle. Vol. 1. Edited by Cyrille Vogel and Reinhard Elze. Studi e testi, 226. Città di Vaticano: Biblioteca apostolica Vaticana, 1963.

Liber diurnus Romanorum Pontificum. Edited by Theodor Sickel. Vindobonae: Apud C. Geroldi Filium Bibliopolam, 1889.

Litterae Gregorii II papae decretales. Edited by Georg Heinrich Pertz. MGH Leges 3, 451–454. Hannoverae: Hahn, 1863.

Miracula sancti Adalberti. Edited by Wojciech Kętrzyński. MPH 4, 226–238. Lwów, 1884.

Miracula sancti Germani episcopi Antissiodorensis auctore Herico monacho. PL 124, cols. 1207–1270. Parisiis, 1879.

Nicolai I. Papae Epistolae ad res orientales, praecipue ad causam Ignatii et Photii pertinentes. Edited by Ernst Perels. MGH Epistolae 6. *Epistolae aevi Karolini* 4, 433–610. Berolini: Weidmann, 1925.

Notitia Arnonis und Breves Notitiae. Die Salzburger Güterverzeichnisse aus der Zeit um 800: Sprachlich-historische Einleitung, Text und Übersetzung. Edited by Fritz Lošek. In *Mitteilungen der Gesellschaft für Salzburger Landeskunde* 130 (1990): 80–101.

Notitia Concilii Rispacensis. MGH Concilia, ed. Albert Werminghoff, vol. 2: *Concilia aevi Carolini*, 1, Hannoverae et Lipsiae: Hahn, 1906, 215.

Odorannus de Sens, *Opera omnia*. Edited by Robert-Henri Bautier and Monique Gilles. Sources d'histoire médiévale 4. Paris: Editions du Centre national de la recherche scientifique, 1972.

Oeuvres de Gerbert. Edited by Alexandre Olleris. Paris: F. Thibaud, 1867.

Ottonian Germany. The Chronicon of Thietmar of Merseburg. Translated and annotated by D. A. Warner. Manchester Medieval Sources Series. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2001.

Ottonis III. et Gregorii V. concilium Romanum. MGH Constitutiones et acta publica imperatorum et regum 1. Edited by Ludwig Weiland. Hannoverae: Hahn, 1893.

Papsturkunden, 896–1046. 3 vols. Edited by Harald Zimmermann. Österreichische Akademieder Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist. Klasse, Denkschriften 174, 177, 198. Veröffentlichungender Historischen Kommission 3, 4, 5. Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1984, 1985, 1989.

Petri Damiani Vita beati Romualdi. Edited by Giovanni Tabacco. Fonti per la storia d'Italia 94. Roma: Istituto Storico Italiano per il Medio Evo, 1957.

Piśmiennictwo czasów Bolesława Chrobrego. Edited by Jadwiga Karwasińska and Kazimierz Abgarowicz. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1966.

Raoul Glaber, *Histoires*. Edited by Mathieu Arnoux. Miroir du Moyen Age. Turnhout: Brepols, 1996.

Regesta Pontificum Romanorum. Germania Pontificia. Vol. 10, *Provincia Treverensis*. Part 1, *Archidioecesis Treverensis*. Edited by Egon Boshof, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1992.

Rocznik kapituły krakowskiej. Edited by Zofia Kozłowska-Budkowa. *In Najdawniejsze roczniki krakowskie i kalendarz*. MPH Nova series 5, 19–105. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1978.

Ruotgeri Vita Brunonis archiepiscopi Coloniensis. Edited by Irene Schmale-Ott. MGH SS rerum Germanicarum Nova series 10. Köln-Graz: Böhlau, 1958.

Sancti Adalberti Pragensis episcopi et martyris Vita altera auctore Brunone Querfurtensi. Edited by Jadwiga Karwasińska. MPH Nova series 4.2. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1969.

Sancti Adalberti Pragensis episcopi et martyris Vita prior. Edited by Jadwiga Karwasińska. MPH Nova series 4.1. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1962.

S. Cornelii Compendiensis Translationes, 1. Edited by Paul von Winterfeld. MGH Poetae Latini 4.1, 237–239.

Salzburger Urkundenbuch. Vol. 2, *Urkunden von 790–1199*. Edited by Willibald Hauthaler and Franz Martin. Salzburg: Gesellschaft für Salzburger Landeskunde, 1916.

Sancti Leonis IX Romani Pontificis Epistolae et decreta pontificia. PL 143, cols. 591–788. Parisiis, 1882.

Schlesisches Urkundenbuch. Vol. 1. Edited by Heinrich Appelt. Wien-Köln-Graz: Böhlau, 1971.

Sermo de beato Maiolo. Edited by Dominique Iogna-Prat. In Dominique Iogna-Prat, *Agni immaculati. Recherches sur les sources hagiographiques relatives à saint Maieul de Cluny (954–994)*, 287–301. Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1988.

The Life of Saint Adalbert Bishop of Prague and Martyr. Edited and translated by Cristian Gaşpar. In *Vitae sanctorum aetatis conversionis Europae Centralis (saec. X–XI)*, edited by Gábor Klaniczay. Central European Medieval Texts 6, 77–182. Budapest-New York: Central European University Press, 2013.

Thietmari Merseburgensis episcopi Chronicon. Edited by Robert Holtzmann. MGH SS rerum Germanicarum Nova series 9. Berlin: Weidmann, 1935.

Translatio duodecim Martyrum [2300]. Edited by Georg Waitz. MGH SS rerum Langobardicarum et Italicarum saec. VI–IX, 574–576. Hannoverae: Hahn, 1878.

Translatio sancti Mercurii [BHL 5936]. Edited by Georg Waitz. MGH SS rerum Langobardicarum et Italicarum saec. VI–IX, 576–578. Hannoverae: Hahn, 1878.

Translatio sancti Mercurii [BHL 5938]. MGH SS rerum Langobardicarum et Italicarum saec. VI–IX, 578–580. Hannoverae: Hahn, 1878.

Translatio SS. Januarii Festi et Desiderii. In *Acta Sanctorum. Septembris* 6, c. 9, 888–891. Parisiis-Romae, 1867.

Urkundenbuch des Erzstifts Magdeburg. Vol. 1. Edited by Friedrich Israël and Walter Möllenberg. Geschichtsquellen der Provinz Sachsen und des Freistaates Anhalt. Neue Reihe. 18. Magdeburg: Selbstverlag der Landesgeschichtlichen Forschungs-atelle, 1937.

Versus de Gregorio et Ottone Augusto. Edited by Karl Strecker. MGH Poetae Latini 5.2, 477–480. Berlin: Weidmann, 1939.

Vie de Saint Germain d'Auxerre. Edited by René Borius. Sources chrétiennes 112. Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1965.

Vita Bernwardi episcopi Hildesheimensis auctore Thangmaro. MGH SS 4. Edited by Georg Heinrich Pertz, 754–782. Hannoverae: Hahn, 1841.

Vita Burchardi episcopi. Edited by Georg Waitz. MGH SS 4, 829–846. Hannoverae: Hahn, 1841.

Vita Corbiniani auctore Arbeone. Edited by Bruno Krusch. MGH SRM 6, 560–593. Hannoverae-Lipsiae: Hahn, 1913.

Vita Germani Constantio presbytero ex Ms. Chifflentiano cum aliis multis collato. In *Acta Sanctorum. Iulii* 7, 211–232. Parisiis-Romae: V. Palmé, 1868.

Vita Germani episcopi Autissioderensis auctore Constantio. Edited by Wilhelm Levison. MGH SS Rerum Merovingicarum 7, 247–283. Hannoverae-Lipsiae: Hahn, 1920.

Vita Heinrici II. imperatoris auctore Adalboldo. Edited by Georg Waitz. MGH SS 4, 679–695. Hannoverae: Hahn, 1841.

Vita Hrodberti episcopi Salisburgensis. Edited by Wilhelm Levison. MGH SRM 6, 157–162. Hannoverae-Lipsiae: Hahn, 1913.

Vita Meinwerci episcopi Patherbrunnensis. Edited by Franz Tenckhoff. MGH SS rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum 59. Hannoverae: Hahn, 1921.

Vita Quinque Fratrum Eremitarum [*seu*] *Vita uel Passio Benedicti et Iohannis sociorumque suorum auctore Brunone Querfurtensi*. Edited by Jadwiga Karwasińska. MPH Nova series 4.3, 7–84. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1973.

Vita Richarii sacerdotis Centulensis primigenia. Edited by Bruno Krusch. MGH SRM 7, 444–453. Hannoverae-Lipsiae: Hahn, 1920.

Vita Richarii confessoris Centulensis auctore Alcuino. Edited by Bruno Krusch. MGH SRM 4, 389–401. Hannoverae-Lipsiae: Hahn, 1902.

Vita sancti Maioli. Edited by Dominique Iogna-Prat. In Dominique Iogna-Prat, *Agni immaculati. Recherches sur les sources hagiographiques relatives à saint Maieul de Cluny (954–994)*, 154–285. Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1988.

Vita sancti Stanislai Cracoviensis episcopi (Vita maior). Edited by Wojciech Kętrzyński. MPH 4, 362–438. Lwów: Lwów: W komisie księgarni Gubrunowicza i Schmidta, 1884.

Vita ss. Eucharii, Valerii, Materni, auctore Golschero monacho Trevirensi, ex variis veteribus mss. Codicibus. In *Acta Sanctorum. Ianuarii* 3, 533–537. Parisiis: Taurini, 1863.

Walahfridi Strabi Carmina. Edited by Ernst Dümmler. MGH Poetae Latini 2, no. 77 (*De sancto Ianuario martyre*), 415–416. Berolini: Weidmann, 1884.

Żywot Metodego. In *Żywoty Konstantyna i Metodego*. Edited by Tadeusz Lehr-Spławiński, 95–121. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Alfa, 2000.

Secondary Literature

1000 lat archidiecezji gnieźnieńskiej, edited by Jerzy Strzelczyk and Janusz Górny. Gniezno: Gaudentinum, 2000.

1200 Jahre Erzbistum Salzburg. Die älteste Metropole im deutschen Sprachraum, edited by Heinz Dopsch, Peter F. Kramml, and Alfred Stefan Weiss. Mitteilungen der Gesellschaft für Salzburger Landeskunde 18, Ergänzungsband = Salzburger Studien. Forschungen zu Geschichte, Kunst und Kultur 1. Band. Salzburg: Gesellschaft für Salzburger Landeskunde, 1999.

Abraham, Władysław. *Organizacja Kościoła w Polsce do połowy wieku XII*, 3rd ed. (posthumous). Poznań: Pallotinum, 1962.

Adalbert von Prag (956–997). Brückenbauer zwischen dem Westen und dem Osten Europas, edited by Hans Hermann Henrix. Schriften der Adalbert-Stiftung 4. Baden-Baden: Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft, 1997.

Althoff, Gerd. "Gandersheim und Quedlinburg. Ottonische Frauenklöster als Herrschafts- und Überlieferungszentren." *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 25 (1991): 123–144.

———. *Otto III*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1997 (1st ed. 1996).

———. "Widukind von Corvey. Kronzeuge und Herausforderung." *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 27 (1993): 253–272.

Amman, Émile and Auguste Dumas. *L'Eglise au pouvoir des laïcs (888–1057)*. Histoire de l'Eglise depuis les origines jusqu'à nos jours 7. Paris: Bloud and Gay, 1948.

Andenna, Giancarlo. "Silvestro, Roma e le Gallie." In *Gerberto d'Aurillac da Abate di Bobbio a Papa*, 517–542.

Angenendt, Arnold. "In porticu ecclesiae sepultus. Ein Beispiel von himmlisch-irdischer Spiegelung." In *Iconologia sacra. Mythos, Bildkunst und Dichtung in der Religions- und Sozialgeschichte Alteuropas. Festschrift für Karl Hauck zum 75. Geburtstag*, edited by Hagen Keller and Nikolaus Staubach. Arbeiten zur Frühmittelalterforschung 23, 68–80. Berlin-New York: de Gruyter, 1994.

———. *Kaiserherrschaft und Königstaufe. Kaiser, Könige, und Päpste als geistliche Patrone in der abendländischen Missionsgeschichte*. Arbeiten zur Frümittelalterforschung 15. Berlin-New York: de Gruyter, 1984.

———. "Karl der Grosse als rex et sacerdos" In *Das Frankfurter Konzil von 794: Kristallisationspunkt karolingischer Kultur*, edited by Rainer Berndt. Vol. 1, 255–278. Mainz: Selbstverlag der Gesellschaft für Mittelrheinische Kirchengeschichte, 1997.

Autour de Gerbert d'Aurillac, le pape de l'An Mil, edited by Olivier Guyotjeannin and Emmanuel Poulle. Matériaux pour l'Histoire publiés par l'Ecole des Chartes 1. Paris: École des chartes, 1996.

Banaszak, Marian. "Charakter prawny biskupów Jordana i Ungera." *Nasza Przeszłość* 30 (1969): 43–123.

Banaszkiewicz, Jacek. "Otton III jedzie do Gniezna. O oprawie ceremonialnej wizyty cesarza w kraju i stolicy Polan." In *Trakt cesarski*, 277–315.

———. *Podanie o Piaście i Popielu. Studium porównawcze nad wczesnośredniowiecznymi tradycjami dynastycznymi*. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1986.

———. "Tradycje dynastyczno-plemienne Słowiańszczyzny północnej." In *Ziemie polskie w X wieku*, 261–277.

Bandmann, Günter, "Früh- und Hochmittelalterliche Altaranordnung als Darstellung." In *Das erste Jahrtausend. Kultur und kunst im werdenden Abendland an Rhein und Ruhr*, edited by Victor Heinrich Elbern. Vol. 1, 371–411. Düsseldorf: Schwann, 1962.

Barone, Giulia. "Jean de Gorze, moine bénédictin." In *L'abbaye de Gorze*, 141–158.

———. "Jean de Gorze. Moine de réforme et saint original." In *Religion et Culture autour l'an mil. Royaume capétien et Lotharingie*, edited by Dominique Iogna-Prat and Jean-Charles Picard, 31–38. Paris: Picard, 1990.

———. "Une hagiographie sans miracles. Observations en marges de quelques vies du Xᵉ siècle." In *Les fonctions des saints dans le monde occidental (IIIᵉ–XIIIᵉ siècle). Actes du colloque organisé par l'Ecole française Rome avec le concours de l'Université de Rome 'La Sapienza'.* Collection de l'Ecole française de Rome 149, 435–446. Rome: École française de Rome, 1991.

———. "Wkład Sylwestra II w 'spotkanie gnieźnieńskie' (9 marca 1000)." In *Milenium Synodu-Zjazdu Gnieźnieńskiego*, 55–69. Lublin: Instytut Europy Środkowo-Wschodniej, 2001.

Becker, Alfons. *Studien zum Investiturproblem in Frankreich. Papsttum, Königtum und Episkopat im Zeitalter der gregorianischen Kirchenreform*. Saarbrücken: Westesy Verlag, 1955.

Belting, Hans. "Studien zum beneventanischen Hof im 8. Jahrhundert." *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 16 (1962): 141–193.

Benson, Robert L. "Provincia=Regnum." In *Prédication et propagande au Moyen Age. Islam, Byzance, Occident*, edited by George Makdisi, Dominique Sourdel, and Janine Sourdel-Thomine. Penn-Paris-Dumbarton Oaks Colloquia 3, 41–69. Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1983.

Benz, Karl-Josef. "Macht und Gewissen im hohen Mittelalter. Der Beitrag des Reformsmönchtums zur Humanisierung des Herrscherethos unter Otto III." In *Consuetudines monasticae. Eine Festgabe für Kassius Hallinger*, edited by Joachim F. Angerer and Josef Lenzenweger. Studia Anselmiana 85, 157–174. Roma: Pontificio Ateneo S. Anselmo, 1982.

———. *Untersuchungen zur politischen Bedeutung der Kirchweihe unter Teilnahme der deutschen Herrscher im hohen Mittelalter*. Regensbuger Historische Forschungen 4. Kallmünz Opf.: M. Lassleben, 1975.

Bernard, Honore. "Saint-Riquier: une restitution nouvelle de la Basilique d'Angilbert." *Revue du Nord* 71 (1989), 281: 307–361.

Bernhardt, John William. "Der Herrscher im Spiegel der Urkunden: Otto III. und Heinrich II. im Vergleich." In *Otto III.—Heinrich II. eine Wende?*, 327–348.

Bertolini, Ottorino. "Le chiese longobarde dopo la conversione al cattolicesimo ed i loro rapporti con il papato." In *Le chiese nei regni dell'Europa occidentale e i loro rap-*

porti sino all'800. Vol. 1. Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo 7/I, 453–492. Spoleto: Presso la Sede del Centro, 1960.

Beumann, Helmut. "Das Kaisertum Ottos des Grossen. Ein Rückblick nach tausend Jahren." (1st ed. 1962). In Helmut Beumann, *Wissenschaft vom Mittelalter*, 411–458.

———. "Das päpstliche Schisma von 1130, Lothar III. und die Metropolitanrechte von Magdeburg und Hamburg-Bremen in Polen und Dänmark." In Helmut Beumann, *Wissenschaft vom Mittelalter*, 479–500.

———. "Die Bedeutung Lotharingiens für die ottonische Missionspolitik im Osten." (1st ed. 1969). In Helmut Beumann, *Wissenschaft vom Mittelalter*, 377–409.

———. "Die Hagiographie 'bewältigt': Unterwerfung und Christianisierung der Sachsen durch Karl den Grossen." In *Cristianizzazione ed organizzazione ecclesiastica delle campagne nell'alto medioevo. Espansione e resistenze*. Vol. 1. Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo 28/1, 129–163. Spoleto: Presso la Sede del Centro, 1982.

———. "Entschädigung von Halberstadt und Mainz bei der Gründung des Erzbistums Magdeburg." In *Ex ipsis rerum documentis*, 383–398.

———. "Grab und Thron Karls des Grossen zu Aachen." In Helmut Beumann, *Wissenschaft vom Mittelalter*, 347–376.

———. "Laurentius und Mauritius. Zu den missionspolitischen Folgen des Ungarnsieges Ottos des Grossen." In *Festschrift für Walter Schlesinger*, edited by Helmut Beumann. Vol. 1. Mitteldeutsche Forschungen, 74/II, 238–275. Köln-Wien: Böhlau, 1974.

———. "Otto III." In *Kaisergestalten des Mittelalters*, edited by Helmut Beumann, 73–97. München: C. H. Beck, 1984.

———. *Theutonum nova metropolis. Studien zur Geschichte des Erzbistums Magdeburg in ottonischer Zeit*, edited by Jutta Krimm-Beumann. Quellen und Forschungen zur Geschichte Sachsen-Anhalts 1. Köln: Böhlau, 2000.

———. *Widukind von Korvei. Untersuchungen zur Geschichtsschreibung und Ideengeschichte des 10. Jahrhunderts*. Abhandlungen über Corveyer Geschichtsschreibung 3. Weimar: H. Böhlaus Nachf., 1950.

———. *Wissenschaft vom Mittelalter. Ausgewählte Aufsätze*. Köln-Wien: Böhlau, 1972.

———. "Zur Textgeschichte der Vita Ruperti." In *Festschrift für Hermann Heimpel*. Vol. 3. Veröffentlichungen des Max Planck-Instituts für Geschichte 36/III, 166–192. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1972.

———. Schlesinger, Walter. *Urkundenstudien zur deutschen Ostpolitik unter Otto III.* (1st ed. 1955). In Walter Schlesinger, *Mitteldeutsche Beiträge zur deutschen Verfassungsgeschichte des Mittelalters*, 306–412 and in addition to 2nd ed., 479–483. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1961.

Beyerle, Konrad. "Aus dem liturgischen Leben der Reichenau." In *Die Kultur der Abtei Reichenau. Erinnerungsschrift der zwölfhundertsten Wiederkehr des Gründungsjahres*

des Inselklosters 724–1924, edited by Konrad Beyerle. Vol. 1, 354–356. München: Münchner Drucke, 1925.

Binon, Stéphane. *Essai sur le cycle de saint Mercure, Martyr de Dèce et meurtrier de l'Empereur Julien*. Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Hautes Etudes, Sciences religieuses 53. Paris: Leroux, 1937.

Bloch, Hermann. "Beiträge zur Geschichte des Bischofs Leo von Vercelli und seiner Zeit." *NA* 22 (1897): 13–136.

Bogdanowicz, Piotr. "Co można wydedukować z kroniki Thietmara? Ważny fragment z dziejów Bolesława Chrobrego." *Nasza Przeszłość* 10 (1959): 71–111.

Bogdanowicz, Piotr. "Geneza aktu dyplomatycznego zwanego Dagome iudex." *Roczniki Historyczne* 25 (1959): 9–33.

Bogdanowicz, Piotr. "Zjazd gnieźnieński w roku 1000." *Nasza Przeszłość* 16 (1962): 5–151.

Böhmer, Heinrich. *Kirche und Staat in England und der Normandie im 11. Und 12. Jahrhundert*. Leipzig: Dieterich'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, Theodor Weicher, 1899.

Böhmer, Johann Friedrich. *Regesta Imperii*. Vol. 2.3, *Sächsisches Haus: 919–1024*: *Die Regesten des Kaiserreiches unter Otto III.*, edited by Mathilde Uhlirz. Graz-Köln: Böhlau, 1956–1957.

Borawska, Danuta. *Kryzys monarchii wczesnopiastowskiej w latach trzydziestych XI w.* Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1964.

Borgolte, Michael. "Biographie ohne Subjekt, oder wie man durch quellenfixierte Arbeit Opfer des Zeitgeistes werden kann." *Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen* 249 (1997): 128–141.

———. "Die Stiftungsurkunden Heinrichs II. Eine Studie zum Handlungsspielraum des letzten Liudolfingers." In *Festschrift für Eduard Hlawitschka zum 65. Geburtstag*, edited by Roland Pauler, Karl Rudolf Schnith. Münchener Historische Studien. Abteilung Mittelalterliche Geschichte 5, 231–250. Kallmünz Opf.: Lassleben, 1993.

Bornscheuer, Lothar. *Miseriae regum. Untersuchungen zum Krisen- und Todesgedanken in den herrschaftstheologischen Vorstellungen der ottonisch-salischen Zeit*. Arbeiten zur Frühmittelalterforschung 4. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1968.

Boshof, Egon. "Das Ostfränkische Reich und die Slawenmission im 9. Jahrhundert: die Rolle Passaus." In *Mönchtum-Kirche-Herrschaft 750–1000*, edited by Dieter R. Bauer, Rudolf Hiestand and Brigitte Kasten, 51–76. Sigmaringen: Thorbecke, 1998.

———. "Das Schreiben der bayerischen Bischöfe an einen Papst Johannes—eine Fälschung Pilgrims?" In *Papstgeschichte und Landesgeschichte. Festschrift für Herrmann Jakobs zum 65. Geburtstag*, edited by Joachim Dahlhaus [et al.]. Beihefte zum Archiv für Kulturgeschichte 39, 37–67. Köln-Weimar-Wien: Böhlau, 1995.

———. "Die Reorganisation des Bistums Passau nach den Ungarnstürmen." In *Das Christentum im bairischen Raum*, 461–483.

———. "Köln-Mainz-Trier. Die Auseinandersetzung um die Spitzenstellung im deutschen Episkopat in ottonisch-salischer Zeit." *Jahrbuch des Kölnischen Geschichtsvereins* 49 (1978): 19–48.

———. "Mainz, Böhmen und das Reich im Früh- und Hochmittelalter." *Archiv für mittelrheinische Kirchengeschichte* 50 (1998): 11–40.

———. "Salzburg und Köln. Die ältesten noch bestehenden Metropolitanverbände im deutschen Sprachraum." In *1200 Jahre Erzbistum Salzburg*, 61–86.

Boussard, Jacques. "Les évêques en Neustrie avant la Réforme Grégorienne (950–1050 environ)." *Journal des Savants* (1970): 161–196.

Bozóki, Edina. "La politique des reliques des premiers comtes de Flandre (fin du IXᵉ–fin du XIᵉ siècle)." In *Les reliques. Objets, cultes, symboles*, 271–292.

———. "L'initiative et la participation du pouvoir laïc dans les translations de reliques au haut Moyen Age. Esquisse typologique." *Sources travaux historiques* 51–52 (1997) [print: 2000]: 49–50.

Brackmann, Albert. "Der 'Römische Erneuerungsgedanke' und seine Bedeutung für die Reichspolitik der deutschen Kaiserzeit." *Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-historische Klasse* 17 (1932): 346–374.

Braun, Joseph. "Brunneneinfassung in S. Bartolomeo all'Isola zu Rom." *Römische Quartalschrift für christliche Altertumskunde und für Kirchengeschichte* 45 (1937): 25–41.

———. *Die liturgische Gewandung in Occident und Orient nach Ursprung und Entwicklung*, Freiburg i. Br.: Herder, 1907.

Brühl, Carlrichard. "Die Kaiserpfalz bei St. Peter und die Pfalz Ottos III. auf dem Palatin." (1st ed. 1954). In Carlrichard Brühl, *Aus Mittelalter und Diplomatik*. Vol. 1, 3–31. Hildesheim-München-Zürich: Weidmann, 1989.

———. *Palatium und Civitas. Studien zur Profantopographie spätantiker Civitates vom 3. bis 13. Jahrhundert*. Vol. 1, *Gallien*. Köln-Wien: Böhlau, 1975.

Budkowa [Kozłowska-Budkowa], Zofia. "Początki piśmiennictwa w Polsce, X–XI w." *Analecta Cracoviensia* 7 (1975): 223–243.

Buko, Andrzej. *Początki Sandomierza*. Warszawa: Instytut Archeologii i Etnologii Polskiej Akademii Nauk, 1998.

Bultot, Robert. *La doctrine du mépris du monde*. Part IV, *Le XIᵉ siècle*. Vol. 1, *Pierre Damien*. Louvain: Editions Nauwelaerts; Paris: Béatrice Nauwelaerts, 1963.

Büttner, Heinrich. "Die christliche Kirche ostwärts der Elbe bis zum Tode Ottos I." In *Festschrift für Friedrich Zahn*. Vol. 1, 145–181.

———. "Die Mainzer Bischöfe Friedrich und Wilhelm und das Papsttum des 10. Jahrhunderts." In Heinrich Büttner, *Zur frühmittelalterlichen Reichsgeschichte*, edited by Alois Gerlich, 275–288 (1st ed. 1966). Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1975.

———. "Erzbischof Willigis von Mainz und das Papsttum bei der Bistumserrichtung in Böhmen und Mähren im 10. Jahrhundert." *Rheinische Vierteljahrsblätter* 30 (1965): 1–22.

———. "Mission und Kirchenorganisation bis zum Tode Karls des Großen." In *Karl der Große*. Vol. 1, *Persönlichkeit und Geschichte*, edited by Helmut Beumann, 454–487. Düsseldorf: L. Schwann, 1965.

Caillet, Jean.-Pierre. "Le mythe architectural roman." *Cahiers de Civilisation Médiévale* 43 (2000): 341–369.

———. "Les horizons monumentaux de Gerbert d'Aurillac." In *Gerbero d'Aurillac da Abate di Bobbio a Papa*, 681–698.

Casimiro da Roma. *Memorie istoriche delle Chiese, e dei Conventi dei frati Minori della Provincia Romana*, Roma: P. Rosati, 1764 [recte: 1744].

Cecchelli, Carlo. *Studi e documenti sulla Roma sacra*. Vol. 2. Società Romana di Storia Patria 18, 29–88. Roma: Presso la Società alla Biblioteca Vallicelliana, 1951.

Ceran, Waldemar. "Cesarz w politycznej teologii Euzebiusza z Cezarei i nauczaniu Jana Chryzostoma." *Acta Universitatis Lodzensis. Folia Historica* 44 (1992): 13–27.

Chudziak, Wojciech. "Wyniki badań weryfikacyjnych i rozpoznawczych na ziemi chełmińskiej." In *Osadnictwo i architektura ziem polskich*, 85–100.

Classen, Peter. *Karl der Grosse, das Papsttum und Byzanz. Die Begründung des karolingischen Kaisertums*, 2nd ed., edited by Horst Fuhrmann and Claudia Märtl. Beiträge zur Geschichte und Quellenkunde des Mittelalters 9. Sigmaringen: Thorbecke, 1988.

Claude, Dietrich. *Geschichte des Erzbistums Magdeburg bis in das 12. Jahrhundert*. Vol. 1, *Die Geschichte der Erzbischöfe bis auf Ruotger (1124)*. Mitteldeutsche Forschungen, 67/I. Köln-Wien: Böhlau, 1972.

Claussen, Hilde. "Eine Reliquiennische in der Krypta auf dem Petersberg bei Fulda." *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 21 (1987): 245–272.

Corbet, Patrick. *Les saints ottoniens. Sainteté dynastique, sainteté royale et sainteté féminin autour de l'an Mil*. Beihefte der Francia 15. Sigmaringen: Thorbecke, 1986.

Cywiński, Piotr Mateusz A. "Druga metropolia Bolesława Chrobrego a Brunon z Kwerfurtu." *Kwartalnik Historyczny* 108, no. 4 (2001): 3–15.

Człowiek w społeczeństwie średniowiecznym, edited by Roman Michałowski [et al.]. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo DiG, 1997.

Dagron, Gilbert. *Empereur et prêtre. Etude sur le "césaropapisme" byzantin*. Paris: Gallimard, 1995.

Das Christentum im bairischen Raum. Von den Anfängen bis ins 11. Jahrhundert, edited by Egon Boshof and Hartmut Wolff. Passauer Historische Forschungen 8. Köln-Wien-Weimar: Böhlau, 1994.

Das erste Jahrtausend. Kultur und Kunst im werdenden Abendland an Rhein und Ruhr, edited by Victor Heinrich Elbern. Textband 1–2. Düsseldorf: Schwann, 1962.

Dąbrowska, Elżbieta. "Pierwotne miejsce pochowania i recepcja relikwii św. Wojciecha we wczesnym średniowieczu." In *Tropami świętego Wojciecha*, 147–158.

Dąbrowska, Małgorzata. "'On—królestw wszystkich władca'. Zawrotna kariera Ottona I i jej bizantyński kontekst." In *Pokłosie Zjazdu Gnieźnieńskiego. O początkach kościoła w Łęczycy*. Towarzystwo Miłośników Ziemi Łęczyckiej w Łęczycy, 9–17. Łęczyca: Towarzystwo Naukowe Płockie. Oddział w Łęczycy, 2002.

Deér, Josef. "Das Kaiserbild im Kreuz: Ein Beitrag zur politischen Theologie des früheren Mittelalters." (1st ed. 1955). In Josef Deér, *Byzanz und das abendländische Herrschertum*, edited by Peter Classen. Vorträge und Foschungen 21, 125–177. Sigmaringen: Thorbecke, 1977.

Delehaye, Hipployte. "La Translatio sancti Mercurii Beneventum." (1st ed. 1908). In Hipployte Delehaye, *Mélanges d'hagiographie grecque et latine*. Subsidia hagiographica, 48, 189–195. Bruxelles: Société des Bollandistes, 1966.

Delforge, Thomas. "Une 'Vita s. Germani' pour Lothaire II." *Scriptorium* 22 (1968): 39–42.

Dercks, Ute. "Die Adlerkapitelle in der Krypta von San Bartolomeo all'Isola in Rom." In *Europas Mitte um 1000*, 809–812.

Derwich, Marek. "Studia nad początkami monastycyzmu na ziemiach polskich. Pierwsze opactwa i ich funkcje." *Kwartalnik Historyczny* 107, no. 2 (2000): 77–105.

Devailly, Guy. "Les grandes familles et l'épiscopat dans l'Ouest de la France et les pays de la Loire." *Cahiers de Civilisation Médiévale* 27 (1984): 49–55.

Devisse, Jean. *Hincmar archevêque de Reims 845–882*. Vols. 1–3. Travaux d'histoire éthico-politique 29. Genève: Droz, 1975–1976.

Die Salier und das Reich, edited by Stefan Weinfurter. Vol. 2, *Reichskirche in der Salierzeit*. Sigmaringen: Thorbecke, 1991.

Diebold, William J. "Nos quoque morem illius imitari cupientes. Charles the Bald's Evocation and Imitation of Charlemagne." *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte* 75 (1993): 271–300.

Dienemann, Joachim. *Der Kult des Heiligen Kilian im 8. und 9. Jh. Beiträge zur geistigen und politischen Entwicklung der Karolingerzeit*. Quellen und Forschungen des Bistums und Hochstift Würzburg 10. Würzburg: Kommissionsverlag F. Schöningh, 1955.

Dormeier, Heinrich. "Die Renovatio Imperii Romanorum und die 'Aussenpolitik' Ottos III. und seiner Berater." In *Polen und Deutschland*, 163–191.

Duby, Georges. *Rok tysięczny*. Warszawa: Oficyna Wydawnicza Volumen, 1997.

Duchesne, Louis. *Origines du culte chrétien* (5th ed.). Paris: E. de Boccard, 1920.

Duczko, Władysław. "Real and Imaginary Contributions of Poland and Rus to the Conversion of Sweden." In *Early Christianity in Central and East Europe*, 130–135.

Dunin-Wąsowicz, Teresa. "'Pereum' medioevale." *Felix Ravenna. Rivista di antichità Ravennati, christiani, bizantine* 116 (1978): 87–101.

———. "Di sequenza in sequenza: Adalberto, Reichenau, Gniezno." In *Clio et son regard. Mélanges offerts à Jacques Stiennon*, edited by Rita Lejeune and Joseph Deckers, 189–198. Liège: Pierre Mardaga, 1982.

———. "Le culte de Saint Adalbert vers l'an Mil et la fondation de l'église Saint-Adalbert à Liège." In *La collégiale Saint-Jean de Liège. Mille ans d'art et d'histoire*, edited by Joseph Deckers, 35–38. Liège: Pierre Mardaga, 1981.

———. "Najstarsi polscy święci: Izaak, Mateusz i Krystyn." In *Kościół, kultura, społeczeństwo*, 35–47.

———. "Ślady kultu świętego Wojciecha w Europie zachodniej około roku 1000." In *Tropami świętego Wojciecha*, 221–234.

———. "Wezwania św. Wojciecha w Europie Zachodniej." In *Święty Wojciech w polskiej tradycji historiograficznej*, 372–370.

Dupré Theseider, Eugenio. "La 'grande rapina dei corpi santi' dall'Italia al tempo di Ottone I." In *Festschrift Percy Ernst Schramm*, edited by Peter Classen and Peter Scheibert. Vol. 1, 420–432. Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1964.

Dvornik, Francis. *Byzance et la primauté romaine*. Unam sanctam 49. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1964.

———. *Early Christian and Byzantine Philosophy. Origins and Background*. Dumborton Oak Studies 9. Vols. 1–2. Washington: Dumbarton Oaks Center for Byzantine Studies, 1966.

———. *The Idea of Apostolicity of Byzantium and the Legend of the Apostle Andrew*, Cambridge (Massachusetts): Harvard University Press, 1958.

Early Christianity in Central and East Europe, edited by Przemysław Urbańczyk. Congress of Commission Internationale d'Histoire Ecclésiastique Comparée, Lublin 2–6 September 1996. Warszawa: Semper, 1997.

Eggers, Martin. *Das Erzbistum des Method. Lage, Wirkung und Nachleben der kyrillo-methodianischen Mission*. Slavistische Beiträge 339. München: O. Sagner, 1996.

Eickhoff, Ekkehard. *Kaiser Otto III. Die erste Jahrtausendwende und die Entfaltung Europas*. Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1999.

———. "Otto III. in Pereum. Konzept und Verwirklichung seiner Missionspolitik." *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte* 83 (2001), 1: 25–35.

Elbern, Viktor Heinrich. "Zum Verständnis und zur Datierung der Aachener Elfenbeinsitula." In *Das erste Jahrtausend*. Textband 2, 1072–1077.

Engelbert, Pius. "Das Papsttum in der Chronik Thietmars von Merseburg." *Römische Quartalschrift für christliche Altertumskunde und Kirchengeschichte* 97 (2002): 89–122.

Engels, Odilo. "Der Pontifikatsantritt und seine Zeichen." In *Segni e riti nella Chiesa altomedievale occidentale*. Vol. 2. Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo 33/II, 707–766. Spoleto: Presso la Sede del Centro, 1987.

———. "Die europäische Geisteslage vor 1000 Jahren—ein Rundblick." In *Adalbert von Prag (956–997) Brückenbauer zwischen dem Westen und dem Osten Europas*, edited by Hans Hermann Henrix. Schriften der Adalbert-Stiftung 4, 17–48. Baden-Baden: Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft, 1997.

———. "Die Gründung der Kirchenprovinz Magdeburg und die Ravennater 'Synode' von 968." *Annuarium Historiae Conciliorum* 7 (1975): 136–158.

———. "Metropolit oder Erzbischof? Zur Rivalität der Erzstühle von Köln, Mainz und Trier bis zur Mitte des 11. Jahrhunderts." In *Dombau und Theologie im mittelalterlichen Köln. Festschrift zur 750-Jahrfeier der Grundsteinlegung des Kölner Domes und zum 65. Geburtstag von Joachim Kardinal Meisner 1998*, edited by Ludger Honnefelder, Norbert Trippen and Arnold Wolff. Studien zum Kölner Dom 6, 264–294. Köln: Kölner Dom, 1998.

———. "Mission und Friede an der Reichsgrenze im Hochmittelalter." In *Aus Kirche und Reich. Studien zu Theologie, Politik und Recht im Mittelalter. Festschrift für Friedrich Kempf*, edited by Hubert Mordek, 201–224. Sigmaringen: Thorbecke, 1983.

———. "Ruotgers Vita Brunonis." In *Kaiserin Theophanu. Begegnung des Ostens und Westens um die Wende des ersten Jahrtausends*, edited by Anton von Euw and Peter Schreiner. Vol. 1, 33–46. Köln: Das Museum, 1991.

———. "Theophanu—die westliche Kaiserin aus dem Osten." In *Die Begegnung des Westens mit dem Osten. Kongressakten des 4. Symposions des Mediävistenverbandes in Köln 1991 aus Anlass des 1000. Todesjahres der Kaiserin Theophanu*, edited by Odilo Engels and Peter Schreiner, 13–36. Sigmaringen: Thorbecke, 1991.

Erkens, Franz-Reiner. "'Mirabilia mundi'. Ein kritischer Versuch über ein methodisches Problem und eine neue Deutung der Herrschaft Ottos III." *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte* 79 (1997): 485–498.

———. "Die Rezeption der Lorcher Tradition im hohen Mittelalter." *Ostbairische Grenzmarken* 28 (1986): 195–206.

———. "Die Ursprünge der Lorscher Tradition im Lichte archäologischer, historiographischer und urkundlicher Zeugnisse." In *Das Christentum im bairischen Raum*, 423–459.

Ernst, Ulrich. "Poesie und Geometrie. Betrachtungen zu einem visuellen Pyramidengedicht des Eugenius Vulgarius." In *Geistliche Denkformen in der Literatur des Mittelalters*, edited by Klaus Grubmüller, Ruth Schmidt-Wiegand, and Klaus Speckenbach. Münstersche Mittelalter-Schriften 51, 321–335. München: W. Fink, 1984.

Europas Mitte um 1000. Handbuch zur Ausstellung, edited by Alfred Wieczorek and Hans-Martin Hinz. Textband 1–2. Stuttgart: Theiss, 2000.

Europe around the Year 1000, edited by Przemysław Urbańczyk. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo DiG, 2001.

Ewig, Eugen. *Kaiserliche und apostolische Tradition im mittelalterlichen Trier* (1st ed. 1956/1958). In Eugen Ewig, *Spätantikes und fränkisches Gallien. Gesammelte Schriften*, 51–90. München: Artemis Verlag, 1979.

Ex ipsis rerum documentis. Festschrift Harald Zimmermann, edited by Klaus Herbers, Hans-Henning Kortüm, and Carlo Servatius. Sigmaringen: Thorbecke, 1991.

Falkenhausen, Vera von. "*Gregor von Burtscheid und das griechische Mönchtum in Kalabrien.*" *Römische Quartalschrift für christliche Altertumskunde und Kirchengeschichte* 93, no. 3–4 (1998): 215–250.

———. *Untersuchungen über die byzantinische Herrschaft in Süditalien vom 9. bis ins 11 Jahrhundert*. Schriften zur Geistesgeschichte des Östlichen Europa 1. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1967.

Falkenstein, Ludwig. *Otto III. und Aachen*. MGH Studien und Texte 22. Hannover: Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 1998.

Farina, Raffaele. *L'impero e l'imperatore in Euzebio di Cesarea. La prima teologia politica del cristianesimo*. Bibliotheca theologica Salesiana. Fontes 2. Zürich: Pas, 1966.

Fauvarque, Bertrand. "Sylvestre II et Otto III: politique, réforme et utopie, aspects eschatologique." In *Gerberto d'Aurillac da Abate di Bobbio a Papa*, 545–596.

Feine, Hans Erich. *Kirchliche Rechtsgeschichte*. Vol. 1, *Die katholische Kirche*, 3rd ed. Weimar: Böhlau, 1955.

Festschrift für Friedrich Zahn. Vol. 1, *Zur Geschichte und Volkskunde Mitteldeutschlands*, edited by Walter Schlesinger. Mitteldeutsche Forschungen 50/I. Köln-Graz: Böhlau, 1968.

Fichtenau, Heinrich. *Urkundenfälschungen Pilgrims von Passau*, 1st ed. 1964. In Heinrich *Beiträge zur Mediävistik*. Vol. 2, 157–179. Stuttgart: Thorbecke, 1977.

Folz, Robert. *L'idée d'Empire en Occident du Ve au XIVe siècle*. Paris: Aubier, 1953.

———. L'interprétation de l'Empire ottonien, In *Occident et Orient au Xe. Actes du IXe Congrès de la Société des Historiens Médiévaux de l'Enseignement Supérieur Public (Dijon, 2–4 juin 1978)*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1979: 13–17.

———. "Un évêque ottonien: Thierry Ier de Metz (965–984)." In *Media in Francia . . . Recueil de Mélanges offert à Karl Ferdinand Werner*. Paris: Hérault 1989: 139–156.

Fornasari, Giuseppe. "*'Pater rationabilium eremitarum': tradizione agiografica e attualisazione eremitica nella Vita beati Romualdi.*" (1st ed. 1983). In Giuseppe Fornasari, *Medioevo riformato del secolo XI. Pier Damiani e Gregorio VII*. Nuovo Medioevo 42, 203–266. Napoli: Liguori, 1996.

Forse, James H. "Bruno of Cologne and the Network of the Episcopate in Tenth-Century Germany." *German History* 9 (1991): 263–279.

Franke, Walter. *Romuald von Camaldoli und seine Reformtätigkeit zur Zeit Ottos III*. Historische Studien 107. Berlin: E. Ebering, 1913.

Frankovich, Géza von. "*Arte carolingia ed ottoniana in Lombardia.*" *Römisches Jahrbuch für Kunstgeschichte* 6 (1942–1944): 113–255.

———. "Contributo alla scultura ottoniana in Italia. Il puteale di S. Bartolomeo all'Isola in Roma." *Bollettino d'Arte. Ministero della Educazione Nazionale* 30, no. 5 (1936): 207–224.

Freitag, Werner. "Heinrich II.—ein Kaiser der letzten Tage? Ein Beitrag zur historischen Anthropologie." *Historische Anthropologie* 6 (1998): 217–241.

Fried, Johannes. "Der Regalienbegriff im 11. und 12. Jahrhundert." *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters* 29 (1973): 450–528.

———. "Endzeiterwartung um die Jahrtausendwende." *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters* 45 (1989): 381–473.

———. "Gnesen—Aachen—Rom. Otto III. und der Kult des hl. Adalbert. Beobachtungen zum älteren Adalbertsleben." In *Polen und Deutschland*, 235–279.

———. *Otto III. und Boleslaw Chrobry. Das Widmungsbild des Aachener Evangeliars, der 'Akt von Gnesen' und das frühe polnische und ungarische Königtum. 2., durchgesehene und erweiterte Aufgabe* (1st ed. 1989). Stuttgart: F. Steiner, 2001.

———. *Święty Wojciech i Polska*. Instytut Historii Uniwersytetu im. Adama Mickiewicza w Poznaniu. Wykłady 5. Poznań: Instytut Historii Uniwersytetu im. Adama Mickiewicza, 2001.

———. "Theophanu und die Slawen. Bemerkungen des Ostens und Westens um die Wende des ersten Jahrhunderts." In *Kaiserin Theophanu. Begegnung des Ostens und Westens um die Wende des ersten Jahrtausends*, edited by Anton von Euw and Peter Schreiner. Vol. 2, 361–370. Köln: Das Museum, 1991.

Frova, Carla. "Gerberto philosophus, il 'De rationali et ratione uti'." In *Gerberto: scienza, storia e mito*, 351–377.

Frugoni, Chiara. "L'ideologia del potere imperiale nella 'Cattedra di S. Pietro'." *Bullettino dell'Istituto Storico Italiano per il Medioevo* 86 (1976–77): 67–181.

Fuchs, Rüdiger. "La tradition apostolique et impériale à Trèves: mythes de fondations et leurs monuments." In *Epigraphie et iconographie. Actes du Colloque tenu à Poitiers les 5–8 octobre 1995*, edited by Robert Favreau. Civilisation Médiévale 2. Poitiers: Centre d'études supérieures de civilisation médiévale, 1996: 57–74.

Fuhrmann, Horst. "Die ,heilige und Generalsynode' des Jahres 948." (1st ed. 1964). In *Otto der Grosse*, 46–55.

———. *Einfluss und Verbreitung der pseudoisidorischen Fälschungen*. Vols. 1–3. MGH 24/I–III. Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1972–1974.

———. "Konstantinische Schenkung und abendländisches Kaisertum. Ein Beitrag zur Überlieferungsgeschichte des Constitutum Constantini." *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters* 22 (1966): 128–137.

———. "Studien zur Geschichte mittelalterlicher Patriarchate." *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung: Studien zur Rechtsgeschichte. Kanonistische Abteilung* 39 (1953): 112–176; 40 (1954): 1–84; 41 (1955): 95–183.

Fürst, Carl Gerold. *Cardinalis. Prolegomena zu einer Rechtsgeschichte des römischen Kardinalskollegiums*. München: Wilhelm Fink, 1967.

Érszegi, Géza. "Die Christianisierung Ungarns anhand der Quellen." In *Europas Mitte um 1000*. Vol. 2, 600–607.

Gandino, Germana. "Ruolo dei linguaggi e linguaggio di ruoli. Ottone III, Silvestro II e un episodio delle relazioni tra imperio e papato." *Quaderni Storici* 102 (1999): 617–658.

Ganz, David. Goffart, Walter. "Charters earlier than 800 from French Collections." *Speculum* 65 (1990): 906–932.

Gaudemet, Jean. *L'Eglise dans l'Empire Romain*. Histoire du droit et des institutions de l'Eglise en Occident 3. Paris: Sirey, 1958.

Gavinelli, Simona. "Leone di Vercelli Postillatore di Codici." *Aevum* 75 (2001): 233–262.

Gawlas, Sławomir. "Der hl. Adalbert als Landespatron und die frühe Nationenbildung bei den Polen." In *Polen und Deutschland*, 193–233.

Gerbert—Moine, évêque et pape: d'un millénaire à l'autre. Actes des journées d'étude, Aurillac, 9–10 avril 1999. Aurillac: Association cantalienne pour la commémoration du pape Gerbert, 2000.

Gerbert l'Européen. Actes du colloque d'Aurillac 4–7 juin 1996. Société des lettres, sciences et arts 'La Haute Auvergne'. Mémoires 3. Aurillac: Ed. Gerbert, 1996.

Gerberto d'Aurillac da Abbate di Bobbio al Papa dell'Anno 1000. Atti del Congresso Internazionale Bobbio, Auditorium di S. Chiara, 28–30 settembre 2000, edited by Flavio G. Nuvolone. Archivum Bobbiense. Studia 4. Bobbio: Associazione culturale Amici di Archivum Bobiense, 2001.

Gerberto: scienza, storia e mito. Atti del Gerberti Symposium (Bobbio 25–27 luglio 1983). Archivum Bobbiense. Studia 2. Bobbio (Piacenza): Archivi storici bobiensi, 1985.

Geschichte Salzburgs. Vol. 1, edited by Heinz Dopsch. Salzburg: Universitätsverlag Pustet, 1981.

Giese, Wolfgang. *Der Stamm der Sachsen und das Reich in ottonischer und salischer Zeit*. Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1979.

Gieysztor, Aleksander. "Dobrowolne ubóstwo, ucieczka od świata i średniowieczny kult św. Aleksego." In *Polska w świecie. Szkice z dziejów kultury polskiej*, 21–40.

———. "L'Europe nouvelle autour de l'an mil. La papauté, l'empire et les 'nouveaux venus'." Unione internazionale degli istituti di archeologia, storia e storia dell'arte di Roma. Conferenze 13. Roma, 1997.

———. "Les paliers de la pénétration du christianisme en Pologne au Xe et XIe siècle." In *Studi in onore di Amintore Fanfani*. Vol. 1, 327–367. Milano: Giuffrè, 1962.

———. "Pierwsi benedyktyni w Polsce piastowskiej." In *Benedyktyni tynieccy w średniowieczu. Materiały z sesji naukowej Wawel-Tyniec, 13–15 października 1994*, edited by Klementyna Żurowska, 9–21. Kraków: Tyniec, 1995.

———. "Politische Heilige im hochmittelalterlichen Polen und Böhmen." In *Politik und Heiligenverehrung im Hochmittelalter*, edited by Jürgen Petersohn. Vorträge und Forschungen 42, 325–341. Sigmaringen: Thorbecke, 1994.

———. "Rzymska studzienka ze św. Wojciechem z roku około 1000." (1st ed. 1966). In *Święty Wojciech w polskiej tradycji historiograficznej tradycji*, 337–346.

———. "Saints d'implantation, saints de souche dans les pays évangélisés de l'Europe du Centre-Est." In *Hagiographie, cultures et sociétés IVᵉ–XIIᵉ. Actes du Colloque organisé à Nanterre et à Paris (2–5 mai 1979)*, 573–582. Paris: Études Augustiniennes, 1981.

———. "Sanctus et gloriosissimus martyr Christi Adalbertus: un Etat et une Eglise missionaires aux alentours de l'an Mille." In *La conversione al christianesimo nell'Europa nell'alto medioevo*. Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo 14, 611–647. Spoleto: Presso la Sede del Centro, 1967.

———. "Sylwester II i Kościoły w Polsce i na Węgrzech." In *Święty Wojciech w tradycji i kulturze europejskiej*, 47–56.

Gniezno w świetle ostatnich badań archeologicznych, edited by Zofia Kurnatowska. Poznańskie Towarzystwo Przyjaciół Nauk. Wydział Historii i Nauk Społecznych. Prace Komisji Archeologicznej 21. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Poznańskiego Towarzystwa Przyjaciół Nauk, 2001.

Gołembnik, Andrzej. "Początki Płocka w świetle ostatnich prac weryfikacyjnych i nowych odkryć archeologicznych." In *Osadnictwo i architektura ziem polskich*, 167–177.

Görich, Knut. "Ein Erzbistum in Prag oder in Gnesen?" *Zeitschrift für Ostforschung* 40 (1991): 10–27.

———. "Eine Wende im Osten? Heinrich II. und Boleslaw Chrobry." In *Otto III.—Heinrich II. eine Wende?*, 95–167.

———. "Kaiser Otto III. und Aachen." In *Europas Mitte um 1000*. Vol. 2, 786–791.

———. "Otto III. öffnet das Karlsgrab in Aachen. Überlegungen zu Heiligenverehrung, Heiligsprechung und Traditionsbildung." In *Herrschaftsrepräsentation im ottonischen Sachsen*, edited by Gerd Althoff and Ernst Schubert. Vorträge und Forschungen 46, 381–430. Sigmaringen: Thorbecke, 1998.

———. *Otto III. Romanus, Saxonicus et Italicus. Kaiserliche Rompolitik und sächsische Historiographie*. Historische Forschungen 18. Sigmaringen: Thorbecke, 1993.

———. Kortüm, Hans-Henning. "Otto III., Thangmar und die Vita Bernwardi." *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung* 98 (1990): 1–57.

Gougenheim Sylvain. *Les fausses terreurs de l'an Mil*. [Paris]: Picard, 1999.

Haari-Oberg, Ilse. *Die Wirkungsgeschichte der Trierer Gründungsgeschichte vom 10. bis 15. Jahrhundert*. Europäische Hochschulschriften. Reihe III. Geschichte und ihre Hilfswissenschaften 607. Bern: Lang, 1994.

Hacke, Kurt-Bogislav Graf von. *Die Palliumsverleihungen bis 1143. Eine diplomatisch-historische Untersuchung*. Diss. Göttingen, 1898.

Haiger, Ernst. "Königtum und Kirchenorganisation: Erzbistumgründungen im Hochmittelalter." *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 112 (2001): 311–329.

Hamilton, Bernard. "The Monastery of S. Alessio and the Religious and Intellectual Renaissance of Tenth-Century Rome." *Studies in Medieval and Renaissance History* 2 (1965): 265–310.

Hamilton, Sarah. "'Most illustrious king of kings'. Evidence for Ottonian kingship in the Otto III prayerbook (Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 30111)." *Journal of Medieval History* 27 (2001): 257–288.

Handbuch der europäischen Geschichte, edited by Theodor Schieder. Vol. 1. Stuttgart: Union Verlag, 1976.

Hardy, Madeleine. Labbé, Alain. "En marge du conflit entre Charles le Chauve et Girart de Vienne. Loup de Ferrières, Remi d'Auxerre et le peintre Fredilo." In *La chanson de geste et le mythe carolingien. Mélanges René Louis*. Vol. 1. Saint-Père-sous-Vézelay: Musée archéologique régional, 1982.

Hartmann, Wilfried. *Die Synoden der Karolingerzeit im Frankenreich und Italien*. Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 1989.

Hauck, Albert. *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands* (8th ed.). Vol. 3. Berlin-Leipzig: Akademie-Verlag, 1954.

Hauck, Karl. "Der Missionsauftrag Christi und das Kaisertum Ludwigs des Frommen." In *Charlemagne's Heir. New Perspectives on the Reign of Louis the Pious (814–840)*, edited by Peter Godman and Roger Collins. Vol. 1, 274–296. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990.

———. "Erzbischof Adalbert von Magdeburg als Geschichtsschreiber." In *Festschrift für Walter Schlesinger*. Vol. 2. Mitteldeutsche Forschungen 74/II, 276–353. Köln-Wien: Böhlau, 1974.

Hehl, Ernst-Dieter. "Herrscher, Kirche und Kirchenrecht im spätottonischen Reich." In *Otto III.—Heinrich II. eine Wende?*, 169–203.

———. "Kaisertum, Rom und Papstbezug im Zeitalter Otto I." In *Ottonische Neuanfänge. Symposion zur Ausstellung „Otto der Grosse, Magdeburg und Europa"*, edited by Bernd Schneidmüller and Stefan Weinfurter, 213–235. Mainz am Rhein: P. von Zabern, 2001.

———. "Lucia/Lucina—Die Echtheit von JL 3848. Zu den Anfängen der Heiligenverehrung Ulrichs von Augsburg." *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters* 51 (1995): 191–211.

Heitz, Carol, *L'architecture religieuse carolingienne. Les formes et leurs fonctions*. Paris: Picard, 1980.

———. *Recherches sur les rapports entre architecture et liturgie à l'époque carolingienne. Introduction de Pierre Francastel*. Paris: Sevpen, 1963.

———. "Saint-Riquier en 800." *Revue du Nord* 69, no. 269 (1986): 335–344.

Herbers, Klaus. "Apostolskość w świadomości i wyobrażeniach. Pytania do planu badań." In *Symbol Apostolski w nauczaniu i sztuce Kościoła do Soboru trydenckiego*, edited by Ryszard Knapiński. Towarzystwo Naukowe Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego. Źródła i Monografie 159, 241–257. Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1997.

———. "Mobilität und Kommunikation in der Karolingerzeit—die Reliquienreisen der heiligen Chrysantus und Daria." In *Literatur—Geschichte—Literaturgeschichte. Beiträge zur mediävistischen Literaturwissenschaft. Festschrift für Volker Honemann zum 60. Geburtstag*, edited by Nine Miedema and Rudolf Suntrup, 647–660. Franfurt am Main: Lang, 2003.

———. "Rom im Frankenreich—Rombeziehungen durch Heilige in der Mitte des 9. Jahrhunderts." In *Mönchtum-Kirche-Herrschaft*, 133–169.

Herren, Michael. "Eriugena's 'Aulae Siderae', the 'Codex Aureus' and the Palatine Church of St. Mary at Compiègne." *Studi Medievali* 28 (1987): 593–608.

Herrmann, Klaus-Jürgen. *Das Tuskulanerpapsttum (1012–1046). Benedikt VIII., Johannes XIX., Benedikt IX.* Päpste und Papsttum 4. Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann, 1973.

Hilsch, Peter. "Der Bischof von Prag und das Reich in sächsischer Zeit." *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters* 28 (1972): 1–41.

Hlawitschka, Eduard. "Kaiser Otto III., der 'Jüngling, der Grosses, ja sogar Unmögliches ersann'." In *Schriften der Sudetendeutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften und Künste*. Vol. 20. Vorträge und Abhandlungen aus geisteswissenschaftlichen Bereichen, 29–74. München: Verlag-Haus Sudetenland, 1999.

———. *Lotharingien und das Reich an dr Schwelle der deutschen Geschichte*. Schriften der MGH 21. Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1968.

Hledíková, Zdenka. "Prag zwischen Mainz und Rom. Beziehungen des Bistums zu seiner Metropole und zum Papsttum." *Archiv für mittelrheinische Kirchengeschichte* 50 (1998): 71–88.

Hoffmann, Hartmut. *Mönchskönig und rex idiota. Studien zur Kirchenpolitik Heinrichs II. und Konrads II.* MGH Studien und Texte 8. Hannover: Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 1993.

———. "Ottonische Fragen." *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters* 51 (1995): 53–82.

———. "Politik und Kultur im ottonischen Reichskirchensystem. Zur Interpretation der Vita Brunonis des Ruotger." *Rheinische Vierteljahrblätter* 22 (1957): 31–55.

———. "Eigendiktat in den Urkunden Ottos III. und Heinrichs II." *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters* 44 (1988): 390–423.

Holtzmann, Robert. *Die Quedlinburger Annalen* (1st ed. 1925). In Robert Holtzmann, *Aufsätze zur deutschen Geschichte im Mittelelberaum*, edited by Albrecht Timm, 193–254. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1962.

Homburger, Otto. "Ein Denkmal ottonischer Plastik in Rom mit dem Bildnis Ottos III." *Jahrbuch der preussischen Kunstsammlungen* 57 (1936): 130–140.

Honselmann, Klemens. "Reliquientranslationen nach Sachsen." In *Das erste Jahrtausend. Kultur und Kunst im werdenden Abendland an Rhein und Ruhr*, edited by Victor Heinrich Elbern. Textband 1, 159–193. Düsseldorf: Schwann, 1962.

Houts, Elisabeth van. "Women and the Writing of History in the Early Middle Ages: the Case of Abbes Matilda of Essen and Aethelweard." *Early Medieval Europe* 1 (1992): 53–68.

Hubert, Jean. "Saint-Riquier et le monachisme bénédictin en Gaule à l'époque carolingienne." In *Il monachesimo nell'alto medioevo e la formazione della civiltà occidentale*. Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo 4, 293–308. Spoleto: Presso la Sede del Centro, 1957.

Huschner, Wolfgang. "Abt Odilo von Cluny und Kaiser Otto III. In Italien und in Gnesen." In *Polen und Deutschland*, 111–161.

I Deug-Su, *Cultura e ideologia nella prima età carolingia*. Istituto Storico Italiano per il Medio Evo. Studi storici 146–147. Roma: Nella sede dell'Istituto, 1984.

———. "Il «libellus» su Ricario di Saint-Riquier. Un caso dell'agiografia merovingia nella critica moderna." *Schede medievali* 5 (1983): 359–382.

———. *L'opera hagiografica di Alcuino*. Biblioteca degli 'Studi medievali' 13. Spoleto: Presso la Sede del Centro, 1983.

Iconologia sacra. Mythos, Bildkunst und Dichtung in der Religions- und Sozialgeschichte Alteuropas. Festschrift für Karl Hauck zum 75. Geburtstag, edited by Hagen Keller and Nikolaus Staubach. Arbeiten zur Frühmittelalterforschung 23. Berlin-New York: de Gruyter, 1994.

Iogna-Prat Dominique. *Agni immaculati. Recherches sur les sources hagiographiques relatives à saint Maieul de Cluny (954–994)*. Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1988.

———. "Le baptême du schéma des trois ordres fonctionels. L'apport de l'Ecole d'Auxerre dans la seconde moitié du IXe siècle." *Annales Economies-Sociétés-Civilisations* 41, no. 1 (1986): 101–126.

———. "Le culte de la Vierge sous le règne de Charles le Chauve." In *Marie. Le culte de la Vierge dans la société médiévale*, edited by Dominique Iogna-Prat, Eric Palazzo, and Daniel Russo, 65–98. Paris: Beauchesne, 1996.

Jacobsen, Peter Christian. "Die Vita s. Germani Heirics von Auxerre." In *L'école carolingienne d'Auxerre*, 329–351.

Janiak, Tomasz. "Uwagi na temat ottońskiej konfesji św. Wojciecha w katedrze gnieźnieńskiej w świetle źródeł historycznych i archeologicznych." In *Trakt cesarski*, 349–381.

Janin, Pierre. "Heiric d'Auxerre et les Gesta pontificum Autissioderensium." *Francia* 4 (1976): 89–105.

Jasiński, Tomasz. "Początki polskiej annalistyki." In *Nihil superflluum esse*, 129–146.

———. "Rocznik obcy w Roczniku kapituły krakowskiej." In *Scriptura custos memoriae. Prace historyczne*, edited by Danuta Zydorek. Publikacje Instytutu Historii UAM 44, 217–224. Poznań: Instytut Historii Uniwersytetu Adama Mickiewicza, 2001.

———. "Rocznik poznański. Ze studiów nad annalistyką polską i czeską." In *Aetas media—aetas moderna. Studia ofiarowane Profesorowi Henrykowi Samsonowiczowi w siedemdziesiątą rocznicę urodzin*, 664–672. Warszawa: Instytut Historyczny Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, 2000.

———. "Rola rocznika augijskiego w rozwoju annalistyki polskiej i niemieckiej." *Roczniki Historyczne* 69 (2003): 71–78.

———. "Tytulatura Bolesława Chrobrego na Zjeździe Gnieźnieńskim." In *Memoriae amici et magistri*, 23–31.

———. "Zagadnienie autorstwa Rocznika obcego. Przyczynek do historiografii niemieckiej X stulecia." *Roczniki Historyczne* 68 (2002): 7–25.

Jeauneau, Édouard. "Heiric d'Auxerre disciple de Jean Scot." In *L'école carolingienne d'Auxerre*, 353–370.

Jedlicki, Zygmunt Marian. "La création du premier archevêché polonais à Gniezno et ses conséquences au point de vue des rapports entre la Pologne et l'Empire germanique." *Revue Historique de Droit Français et Etranger* 12 (1933): 645–695.

Jestice, Phylis G. "The Gorzian Reform and the Light under the Bushel." *Viator* 24 (1993): 51–78.

———. *Wayward Monks and the Religious Revolution of the Eleventh Century*. Brill's Studies in Intellectual History 76. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

Johanek, Peter. "Die Erzbischöfe von Hamburg-Bremen und ihre Kirche im Reich der Salierzeit." In *Die Salier und das Reich*, 79–112.

Jolivet-Lévy, Catherine. "L'image du pouvoir dans l'art byzantin à l'épopque de la dynastie macédonienne (867–1056)." *Byzantion* 57 (1987): 441–470.

Jurek, Tomasz. "Losy arcybiskupstwa gnieźnieńskiego w XI wieku." In *1000 lat Archidiecezji Gnieźnieńskiej*, 49–72.

Kahl, Hans-Dietrich. "Compellere intrare. Die Wendenpolitik Bruns von Querfurt im Lichte hochmittelalterlichen Missions- und Völkerrechts." (1st ed. 1955). In *Heidenmission und Kreuzzugsgedanke in der deutschen Ostpolitik des Mittelalters*, edited by Helmut Beumann. Wege der Forschung 7, 177–274. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1973.

Kaiser, Reinhold. "Die Gesta episcoporum als Genus der Geschichtsschreibung." In *Historiographie im frühen Mittelalter*, edited by Anton Scharer and Georg Scheibelreiter. Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Österrreichische Geschichtsforschung 32, 459–480. Wien-München: Oldenbourg, 1994.

Karpf, Ernst. *Herrscherlegitimation und Reichsbegriff in der ottonischen Geschichtsschreibung des 10. Jahrhunderts*. Historische Forschungen 10. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1985.

Karwasińska, Jadwiga. *Les trois rédactions de «Vita I» de St. Adalbert*. Accademia Polacca di Scienze e Lettere. Bibliotheca di Roma. Conferenze 9. Roma: A. Signorelli, 1960.

———. "Studia krytyczne nad żywotami św. Wojciecha, biskupa praskiego. III. Redakcje Vita I." *Studia Źródłoznawcze* 4 (1959): 9–32.

———. "Studia krytyczne nad żywotami św. Wojciecha, biskupa praskiego. Vita I." *Studia Źródłoznawcze* 2 (1958): 41–79.

———. "Świadek czasów Chrobrego—Brunon z Kwerfurtu." In *Polska w świecie*, 91–105.

Kehr, Paul. *Das Erzbistum Magdeburg und die erste Organisation der christlichen Kirche in Polen*. Abhandlungen der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-Historische Klasse. Berlin: Verlag der Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1920.

Keller, Hagen. "Die Ottonen und Karl der Grosse." *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 34 (2000): 112–131.

———. "Die Siegel und Bullen Ottos III." In *Europas Mitte um 1000*. Vol. 2, 767–773.

———. "Machabeorum pugnae. Zum Stellenwert eines biblischen Vorbilds in Widukinds Deutung der ottonischen Königsherrschaft." In *Iconologia sacra*, 417–437.

———. "Widukinds Bericht über die Aachener Wahl und Krönung Ottos I." *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 29 (1995): 390–453.

———. "Zu Siegeln der Karolinger und Ottonnen. Urkunden als 'Hoheitszeichen' in der kommunikation des Königs mit seinen Getreuen." *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 32 (1998): 400–441.

Kempf, Friedrich. "Primatiale und episkopal-synodale Struktur vor der gregorianischen Reform." *Archivum Historiae Pontificiae* 16 (1978): 26–66.

Kętrzyński, Stanisław. "O zaginionej metropolii czasów Bolesława Chrobrego." In Stanisław Kętrzyński, *Polska X–XI wieku*, 289–351. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1961.

Klewitz, Hans-Walter. "Zur Geschichte der Bistumsorganisation Campaniens und Apuliens im 10. und 11. Jahrhundert." *Quellen und Forschungen von Italienischen Archiven und Bibliotheken* 24 (1932/33): 1–61.

Koczy, Leon. "Misja Brunona wśród Suigiów." *Annales Missiologicae* 5 (1932/33): 82–98.

———. "Misje polskie w Prusach i na Pomorzu." *Annales Missiologicae* 6 (1934): 52–186.

Kolmer, Lothar. "Regensburg oder Salzburg? Die Christianisierung der Bayern und die Errichtung kanonischer Bistümer." In *1200 Jahre Erzbistum Salzburg*, 9–20.

Kölzer, Theo. Ludwig, Thomas. "Das Diplom Ottos III. für Meissen." In *Europas Mitte um 1000*. Vol. 2, 764–766.

Konrad, Robert *De ortu et tempore Antichristi. Antichristvorstellung und Geschichtsbild des Adso von Montier-en-Der*. Münchener Historische Studien. Abteilung Mittelalterliche Geschichte 1. Kallmünz/Opf.: Lassleben, 1964.

Körntgen, Ludger. *Königsherrschaft und Gottesgnade. Zu Kontext und Funktion sakraler Vorstellungen in Historiographie und Bildzeugnissen der ottonisch-frühsalicen Zeit*. Orbis mediaevalis. Vorstellungswelten des Mittelalters 2. Berlin: Oldenbourg Akademieverlag, 2001.

Kortüm, Hans-Henning. "Gerbertus qui et Silvester. Papsttum um die Jahrtausendwende." *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters* 55 (1999): 29–62.

Kościół, kultura, społeczeństwo. Studia z dziejów średniowiecza i czasów nowożytnych, edited by Stanisław Bylina et al. Warszawa: Semper, 2000.

Kottje, Raymund. "König Ludwig der Deutsche und die Fastenzeit." In *Mysterium der Gnade. Festschrift für Johann Auer*, edited by Heribert Rossmann and Joseph Ratzinger, 307–311. Regensburg: F. Pustet, 1975.

Kowalczyk, Elżbieta. "Momenty geograficzne państwa Bolesława Chrobrego. Na styku historii i archeologii." *Kwartalnik Historyczny* 107, no. 2 (2000): 41–76.

Krautheimer, Richard. *Rom. Schicksal einer Stadt, 312–1308*. München: Beck, 1987.

Kretschmar, Georg. "Der Kaiser tauft. Otto der Grosse und die Slawenmission." In *Bleibendes im Wandel der Kirchengeschichte. Kirchenhistorische Studien*, edited by Bernd Moeller and Gerhard Ruhbach, 101–150. Tübingen: Mohr, 1973.

Krusch, Bruno. "Die älteste Vita Richarii." *NA* 21, no. 1 (1903): 13–48.

Kuder, Ulrich. "Die Ottonen in der ottonischen Buchmalerei. Identifikation und Ikonographie." In *Herrschaftsrepräsentation im ottonischen Sachsen*, edited by Gerd Althoff and Ernst Schubert. Vorträge und Forschungen, 137–234. Sigmaringen: Thorbecke, 1998.

L'Europe aux IXᵉ–XIᵉ siècles. Aux origines des Etats nationaux, edited by Tadeusz Manteuffel and Aleksander Gieysztor. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1968.

L'abbaye de Gorze au Xᵉ siècle, edited by Michel Parisse and Otto Gerhard Oexle. Nancy: Presses Universitaires de Nancy, 1993.

Labuda, Gerard. "Der 'Akt von Gnesen' vom Jahre 1000. Bericht über die Forschungsvorhaben und Ergebnisse." *Quaestiones Medii Aevi Novae* 5 (2000): 145–188.

———. *Fragmenty dziejów Słowiańszczyzny Zachodniej*. Vol. 2. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Poznańskie, 1964.

———. *Mieszko I*. Wrocław-Warszawa-Kraków: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 2002.

———. "O badaniach nad zjazdem gnieźnieńskim roku 1000." *Roczniki Historyczne* 68 (2002): 107–156.

———. "O najstarszej organizacji Kościoła w Polsce." *Przegląd Powszechny* (1984) 6/754: 373–396.

———. "O rzekomym zamyśle utworzenia arcybiskupstwa w Pradze w roku 1000— próba wyjaśnienia przekazu źródłowego." In *W kręgu historii, historiografii i polityki*, 237–244. Łódź: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego, 1997.

———. "Spuścizna ideowa martyrium św. Wojciecha w perspektywie dziejów Polski średniowiecznej." In *Człowiek w społeczeństwie średniowiecznym*, 75–87.

———. "Studia dyplomatyczne i geograficzno-historyczne z dziejów Słowiańszczyzny Zachodniej." In Gerard Labuda, *Fragmenty dziejów Słowiańszczyzny Zachodniej*. Vol. 1, 123–204. Poznań Wydawnictwo Poznańskie, 1960.

———. *Studia nad początkami państwa polskiego*. Vol. 1 (1st ed. 1946). Uniwersytet Adama Mickiewicza. Historia 139. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu im. Adama Mickiewicza, 1987.

———. *Studia nad początkami państwa polskiego*. Vol. 2. Uniwersytet Adama Mickiewicza. Historia 140. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu im. Adama Mickiewicza, 1988.

———. "Szkice historyczne jedenastego wieku. I. Najstarsze klasztory w Polsce." In *Z badań nad dziejami klasztorów w Polsce*. Archaeologia Historica Polona 2, 7–73. Toruń: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Mikołaja Kopernika, 1995.

———. *Święty Wojciech biskup-męczennik. Patron Polski, Czech i Węgier* (2nd ed.). Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego, 2004.

———. "Zakres uprawnień władczych nad Kościołem polskim nadanych przez cesarza Ottona III księciu Bolesławowi Chrobremu w Gnieźnie w roku 1000." *Roczniki Historyczne* 64 (1998): 7–12.

———. "Zjazd gnieźnieński roku 1000 w oświetleniu ikonograficznym." *Kwartalnik Historyczny* 98, no. 2 (1991): 3–18.

———. "Zjazd i synod gnieźnieński w roku 1000." *Kwartalnik Historyczny* 107, no. 2 (2000): 107–122.

———. "Zjazd i synod gnieźnieński roku 1000 w nowym oświetleniu historiograficznym." In *Cognitioni gestorum. Studia z dziejów średniowiecza dedykowane Profesorowi Jerzemu Strzelczykowi*. Edited by Dariusz A. Sikorski and Andrzej M. Wyrwa. 163–184. Poznań and Warsaw: Wydawnictwo DiG, 2006.

———. "Znaczenie prawne i polityczne dokumentu Dagome iudex." *Studia i materiały do dziejów Wielkopolski i Pomorza* 13, no. 1 (1979): 83–100.

———. "Znaczenie prawno-polityczne dokumentu 'Dagome iudex'." *Nasza Przeszłość* 4 (1948): 33–60.

Landes, Richard Allen. "Millenarismus absconditus: L'historiographie augustinienne et le millénarisme du Haut Moyen Age jusqu'en l'an Mil." *Le Moyen Age* 98 (1992): 355–377·

———. *Relics, Apocalypse and the Deceits of History. Ademar of Chabannes 989–1034*. Cambridge (Massachusetts): Harvard University Press, 1995.

Laudage, Johannes. "Zur Kaiserkrönung Ottos III." *Geschichte in Köln* 6 (1976): 13–31.

Lauranson-Rosaz, Christian. "Le débat sur la 'mutation féodale': état de la question." In *Europe around the Year 1000*, 11–40.

Leclercq, Jean. "Jean de Gorze et la vie religieuse au Xe siècle." In *Saint Chrodegang*. Metz: Lorrain, 1967: 133–152.

———. "Saint Romuald et le monachisme missionaire." *Revue Bénédictine* 72 (1962): 306–323.

L'école carolingienne d'Auxerre de Muretach à Remi 830–908, edited by Dominique Iogna-Prat, Colette Jeudy, and Guy Lobrichon, Paris: Beauchesne, 1991.

Lehmann, Edgar. "Die Anordnung der Altäre in der karolingischen Klosterkirche zu Centula." In *Karl der Grosse*. Vol. 3. 3rd ed., edited by Wolfgang Braunfels and Hermann Schnitzler. Düsseldorf: Schwann, 1965: 374–383.

Lehr, Waldemar. *Pilgrim, Bischof von Passau, und die Lorcher Forschungen*. Diss. Berlin: Schade, 1909.

Les reliques. Objets, cultes, symboles. Actes du colloque international de l'Université du Littoral-Côte d'Opale (Boulogne-sur-Mer) 4–6 septembre 1997, edited by Edina Bozóky and Anne-Marie Helvétius. Hagiologia 1. Turnhout: Brepols, 1999.

Lesne, Emile. *La hiérarchie épiscopale. Provinces, métropolitains, primats en Gaule et Germanie depuis la réforme de saint Boniface jusqu'à la mort d'Hincmar. 742–882.* Mémoires et Travaux publiés par des professeurs des Facultés Catholiques de Lille 1. Lille: Facultés catholiques, 1905.

Levison, Wilhelm. "Bischof Germanus von Auxerre und die Quellen zu seiner Geschichte." *NA* 29 (1904): 95–175.

Leyser, Karl. "On the Eve of the First European Revolution." In Karl Leyser, *Communications and Power in Medieval Europe: The Gregorian Revolution and Beyond*, edited by Timothy Reuter, 1–19. London-Rio Grande: Hambledon Press, 1994.

Lippelt, Helmut. *Thietmar von Merseburg, Reichsbischof und Chronist*. Mitteldeutsche Forschungen 72. Köln-Wien: Böhlau, 1973.

Lotter, Friedrich. "Christliche Völkergemeinschaften und Heidenmission. Das Weltbild Bruns von Querfurt." In *Early Christianity in Central and East Europe*, 163–174.

———. "Das Bild des hl. Adalbert in der römischen und sächsischen Vita." In *Adalbert von Prag*, 77–107.

———. "Das Idealbild adliger Laienfrömmigkeit in den Anfängen Clunys Odos Vita des Grafen Gerald von Aurillac." In *Benedictine Culture 750–1050*, edited by Willem Lourdaux and Daniël Verhelst. Mediaevalia Lovaniensia. series 1. Studia 11, 76–95. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1983.

———. *Der Brief des Priesters Gerhard an den Erzbischof Friedrich von Mainz. Ein kanonistisches Gutachten aus frühottonischer Zeit*. Vorträge und Forschungen. Sonderband 17. Sigmaringen: Thorbecke, 1975.

———. *Die Vita Brunonis von Ruotger. Ihre historiographische und ideengeschichtliche Stellung*. Bonner Historische Forschungen 9. Bonn: Röhrscheid, 1958.

Louis, René. *Autossiodurum christianum. Les églises d'Auxerre des origines au XIᵉ siècle*. Paris: Clavreuil, 1952.

———. *De l'histoire à la légende. Girart, comte de Vienne (. . . 819–877) et ses fondations monastiques*. Auxerre: Imprimerie Moderne, 1946.

———. "Esquisse d'une histoire du tombeau de Saint Germain d'Auxerre de 448 à nos jours." *L'écho de St. Pierre d'Auxerre* (1958) no. 17: 28–30.

Ludzie, Kościół, wierzenia. Studia z dziejów kultury i społeczeństwa Europy Środkowej (średniowiecze—wczesna epoka nowożytna), edited by Wojciech Iwańczak and Stefan K. Kuczyński. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo DiG, 2001.

Lühmann, Werner. *St. Urban. Beiträge zur Vita und Legende, zum Brauchtum und zur Ikonographie*. Quellen und Forschungen zur Geschichte des Bistums und Hochstift Würzburg 19. Würzburg: Schöningh, 1968.

Łowmiański, Henryk. *Początki Polski*. Vols. 5–6. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1973–1985.

Magnou-Nortier, Elisabeth. *La société laïque et l'Eglise dans la province ecclésiastique de Narbonne (zone cispyrénéenne) de la fin du VIIIᵉ à la fin du XIᵉ siècle*. Publication de l'Université de Toulouse-Le Mirail. Série A. Vol. 20. Toulouse: Association des publications de l'Université de Toulouse-Le Mirail, 1974.

Mâle, Émile. "Etudes sur les églises romaines. L'empereur Otton III à Rome et les églises du Xᵉ siècle." *Revue des deux mondes* 41/107 (1937): 54–82.

Maleczyński, Karol. "Die Politik Otto III. gegenüber Polen und Böhmen im Lichte der Meissener Bistumsurkunden vom Jahre 995." *Lětopis—Jahresschrift des Instituts für Sorbische Volksforschung. Reihe B—Geschichte* 10, no. 2 (1963): 162–203.

———. "W sprawie zjazdu gnieźnieńskiego z 1000 roku." *Sobótka* 21 (1966): 507–540.

Manselli, Raoul. *La religion populaire au Moyen Age. Problèmes de méthode et d'histoire*. Conférences Albert-le-Grand 1973. Montréal: Institut d'études médiévales Albert-le-Grand, 1975.

Marsina, Richard. "Štúdie k slovenskému diplomatáru. I." *Historické štúdie* 16 (1971): 5–108.

Martí Bonet, Jose M. *Roma y las iglesias particulares en la concesión del palio a los obispos y arzobispos de occidente, año 513–1143*. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1976.

Martin, Thomas. "Bemerkungen zur 'Epistola de litteris colendis'." *Archiv für Diplomatik* 31 (1985): 227–272.

Maurer, Helmut. "Rechtlicher Anspruch und geistliche Würde der Abtei Reichenau unter Kaiser Otto iii." In *Die Abtei Reichenau. Neue Beiträge zur Geschichte und Kultur des Inselklosters*, edited by Helmut Maurer, 255–275. Sigmaringen: Thorbecke, 1974.

Memoriae amici et magistri. Studia historyczne poświęcone pamięci Prof. Wacława Korty (1919–1999). Wrocław: Instytut Historyczny Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego, 2001.

Meyszstowicz, Walerian. "La vocation monastique d'Otton iii." *Antemurale* 4 (1958): 27–69.

———. "Szkice o świętym Brunie-Bonifacym." *Sacrum Poloniae Millenium* 5 (1958): 445–501.

Michałowski, Roman. "Adalbert, Sylvestre ii et l'Eglise de Pologne." In *Gerberto d'Aurillac da Abate di Bobbio al Papa*.

———. "Depozycja ciała św. Wojciecha w roku 1000. Przyczynek do dziejów Zjazdu Gnieźnieńskiego." In *Świat pogranicza*, edited by Mirosław Nagielski, Andrzej Rachuba, and Sławomir Górzyński, 45–56. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo DiG, 2003.

———. "La christianisation de la Pologne aux xᵉ–xiiᵉ siècles." In *Clovis. Histoire et mémoire*, edited by Michel Rouche. Vol. 2, *Le baptême de Clovis, son écho à travers l'histoire*, 419–434. Paris: Presses de l'Université de Paris-Sorbonne, 1997.

———. "Jeszcze raz o religijnych przesłankach powstania arcybiskupstwa gnieźnieńskiego. Odpowiedź Recenzentowi." *Kwartalnik Historyczny* 112, no. 4 (2005): 93–115.

———. "Otto iii w obliczu ideowego wyzwania: monarcha jako wizerunek Chrystusa." In *Człowiek w społeczeństwie średniowiecznym*, 57–72.

———. "Początki arcybiskupstwa gnieźnieńskiego." In *1000 lat archidiecezji gnieźnieńskiej*, 27–48.

———. "Podstawy religijne monarchii we wczesnym średniowieczu zachodnioeuropejskim. Próba typologii." *Kwartalnik Historyczny* 105, no. 4 (1998): 3–34.

———. "Die Politik von Otto iii. in neuer Beleuchtung." *Acta Poloniae Historica* 75 (1997): 167–177.

———. "The Nine-Week Lent in Boleslaus the Brave's Poland. A Study of the First Piasts' Religious Policy." *Acta Poloniae Historica* 89 (2004): 5–50.

———. "Prądy religijne w imperium ottońskim i ich polityczne implikacje." In *Polska na przełomie i i ii tysiąclecia*, 51–62.

———. *Princeps fundator. Studium z dziejów kultury politycznej w Polsce X–XIII wieku* (2nd ed.). Warszawa: Arx Regia. Ośrodek Wydawniczy Zamku Królewskiego w Warszawie, 1993.

———. "Prüm i Urbs Caroli. Monarsze fundacje na tle kultury politycznej wczesnych czasów karolińskich." In *Fundacje i fundatorzy w średniowieczu i w epoce nowożytnej*, edited by Edward Opaliński and Tomasz Wiślicz, 11–36. Warszawa: Neriton. Instytut Historii PAN, 2000.

———. "Przyjaźń i dar w społeczeństwie karolińskim w świetle translacji relikwii. Część I: Studium źródłoznawcze." *Studia Źródłoznawcze* 28 (1983): 1–39; "Część II: Analiza i interpretacja." *Studia Źródłoznawcze* 29 (1985): 9–65.

———. Review of *Święty Wojciech biskup-męczennik, patron Polski, Czech i Węgier*, by Gerard Labuda. *Kwartalnik Historyczny* 109, no. 4 (2002): 136–141.

———. Review of *Kodeks Matyldy. Księga obrzędów z kartami dedykacyjnymi*, edited Brygida Kürbis [et al.]. *Studia Źródłoznawcze* 40 (2002): 225–228.

———. "Relacja Galla Anonima o Zjeździe Gnieźnieńskim—problem wiarygodności." In *Tekst źródła—krytyka i interpretacja. Kazimierz Dolny, 17–18 października 2003 roku*, edited by Barbara Trelińska, 57–64. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo DiG, 2005.

———. "Świadomość społeczna saskiej grupy rządzącej w wiekach X–XI. Nobilis, dives, pauper—próba analizy semantycznej." *Studia Źródłoznawcze* 19 (1974): 13–27.

Miladinov, Marina. "Hermits Murdered by Robbers: Construction of Martyrdom in Ottonian Hagiography." *Annual of Medieval Studies at CEU* 6 (2000): 9–21.

Misonne, Daniel. "Gérard de Brogne et sa dévotion aux reliques." *Sacris erudiri* 25 (1982): 1–26.

Möbius, Friedrich. *Westwerkstudien*. Jena: Friedrich-Schiller-Universität, 1968.

Möhring, Hannes. *Der Weltkaiser der Endzeit. Entstehung, Wandel und Wirkung einer tausendjährigen Weissagung*. Mittelalter-Forschungen 3. Stuttgart: Thorbecke, 2000.

Mönchtum-Kirche-Herrschaft 750–1000, edited by Dieter R. Bauer [et al.]. Sigmaringen: Thorbecke, 1998.

Mordek, Hubert. "Von Patrick zu Bonifatius . . . Alkuin, Ferrières und die irischen Heiligen in einem westfränkischen Reliquienverzeichnis." In *Ex ipsis rerum documentis*, 55–68.

Morini, Enrico. "Dall'apostolicità di alcune Chiese dell'Italia bizantina dei secoli VIII e IX. In margine agli 'Analecta Hymnica Greca'." *Rivista di storia della Chiesa in Italia* 36 (1982): 61–79.

———. "Richiami alle tradizioni di apostolicità ed organizzazione ecclesiastica nelle sedi patriarcali d'Oriente." *Bulletino dell'Istituto Storico Italiano per il Medio Evo e Archivio Muratoriano* 89 (1980–1981): 1–69.

Myśliński, Kazimierz. "Sprawa ziem połabskich w rozmowach Ottona III i Bolesława Chrobrego w Gnieźnie w r. 1000." *Studia Historica Slavo-Germanica* 22 (1997) [print: 1999]: 3–24.

Nahmer, Dieter von der. "Die Inschrift auf der Bernwardstür in Hildesheim im Rahmen Bernwardinischer Texte." In *Bernwardinische Kunst*, edited by Martin Gosebruch and Frank Neidhart Steigerwald, 51–70. Göttingen: E. Goltze, 1988.

Nelson, Janet L. "Charles le Chauve et les utilisations du savoir." In *L'école carolingienne d'Auxerre*, 37–54.

Nihil superflluum esse. Studia z dziejów średniowiecza ofiarowane Profesor Jadwidze Krzyżaniakowej, edited by Jerzy Strzelczyk and Józef Dobosz. Publikacje Instytutu Historii UAM 33. Poznań: Instytut Historii Uniwersytetu Adama Mickiewicza, 2000.

Nitschke, August. "Die Wirksamkeit Gottes in der Welt Gregors VII." In *Studi Gregoriani*. Vol. 5, 114–216. Roma: Abbazia di San Paolo, 1956.

Nowacki, Józef. *Kościół katedralny w Poznaniu. Studium historyczne* (Józef Nowacki. *Dzieje archidiecezji poznańskiej* 1). Poznań: Księgarnia Św. Wojciecha, 1959.

Oexle, Otto Gerhard. "Bernward von Hildesheim und die religiösen Bewegungen seiner Zeit." In *Bernward von Hildesheim und das Zeitalter der Ottonen*. Vol. 1, edited by Michael Brandt and Arne Eggebrecht, 355–360. Hildesheim: Bernward Verlag, 1993.

———. "Individuen und Gruppen in der lothringischen Gesellschaft des 10. Jahrhunderts." In *L'abbaye de Gorze*, 105–139.

Ohnsorge, Werner. "Die Anerkennung des Kaisertums durch Byzanz." *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 54 (1961): 28–52.

Osadnictwo i architektura ziem polskich w dobie Zjazdu Gnieźnieńskiego, edited by Andrzej Buko and Zygmunt Świechowski. Warszawa: Letter Quality, 2000.

Ottaway, John. "Collégiale Saint-Aignan." In *Le paysage monumental de la France autour de l'an Mil*, edited by Xavier Barral i Altet, 257–259. Paris: Picard, 1987.

Otto der Grosse, edited by Harald Zimmermann. Wege der Forschung 450. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1976.

Otto III.—Heinrich II. eine Wende?, edited by Bernd Schneidmüller and Stefan Weinfurter. Mittelalter Forschungen 1. Sigmaringen: Thorbecke, 1997.

Pace, Valentino. "'Nihil innovetur nisi quod traditum est': sulla scultura del Medioevo a Roma." In *Studien zur Geschichte der europäischen Skulptur im 12./13. Jahrhundert*. Vol. 1, 587–603. Frankfurt am Main: Henrich, 1994.

Padberg, Lutz E. von. "Geschichtsschreibung und kulturelles Gedächtnis. Formen der Vergangenheitswahrnehmung in der hochmittelalterlichen Historiographie am Beispiel von Thietmar, Adam von Bremen und Helmold von Bosau." *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 105 (1994): 156–177.

Parisse, Michel. "L'abbaye de Gorze dans le contexte politique et religieux lorrain à l'époque de Jean de Vendières (900–974)." In *L'abbaye de Gorze au Xe siècle*, 51–90.

Peri, Vittorio. "La pentarchia: istituzione ecclesiale (IV–VII sec.) e teoria canonico-teologica." In *Bisanzio, Roma e l'Italia nell'alto medioevo*. Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo 34, 209–311. Spoleto: Presso la Sede del Centro, 1988.

———. "Il mandato missionario e canonico di Metodio e l'ingresso della lingua slava nella liturgia." *Archivum Historiae Pontificiae* 26 (1988): 9–69.

———. "La Chiesa di Roma e le missioni 'ad gentes' (sec. VIII–IX)." In *Il primato del vescovo di Roma nel primo millennio. Ricerche e testimonianze. Atti del Symposium Storico-Teologico, Roma, 9–13 Ottobre 1989*, edited by Michele Maccarrone. Pontificio Comitato di Scienze Storiche. Atti e documenti 4, 567–642. Città del Vaticano: Libreria Ed. Vaticana, 1991.

Petersohn, Jürgen. "Apostolus Pommeranorum. Studien zu Geschichte und Bedeutung des Apostelepithetons Bischof Ottos von Bamberg." *Historisches Jahrbuch* 86 (1966): 257–294.

———. "Kaisertum und Kultakt in der Stauferzeit." In *Politik und Heiligenverehrung*, 101–146.

———. "Saint Denis—Westminster—Aachen. Die Karlstranslation von 1165 und ihre Vorbilder." *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters* 31 (1975): 420–454.

Phipps, Colin. "Romuald—Model Hermit: Eremitical Theory in Saint Peter Damian's 'Vita beati Romualdi', Chapters 16–27." In *Monks, Hermits and Ascetic Traditions*, edited by William J. Sheils. Studies in Church History 22, 65–77. Oxford: Blackwell, 1985.

Picard, Jean-Charles. "Espace urbain et sépultures épiscopales à Auxerre." In *La christianisation des pays entre Loire et Rhin (IVᵉ–VIIᵉ siècle). Actes du colloque de Nanterre (3–4 mai 1974)*, edited by Pierre Riché (1st ed. 1976), 205–222. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1993.

———. "Le recours aux origines. Les Vies de saint Clément, premier évêque de Metz, composées autour de l'an Mil." In *Religion et Culture autour l'an mil. Royaume capétien et Lotharingie*, edited by Dominique Iogna-Prat and Jean-Charles Picard, 291–299. Paris: Picard, 1990.

———. *Le souvenir des évêques. Sépultures, listes épiscopales et culte des évêques en Italie du Nord des origines au Xᵉ siècle*. Bibliothèque des Ecoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome 268. Rome: Ecole française de Rome, 1988.

Platelle, Henri. "Le thème de la conversion à travers les oeuvres hagiographiques d'Hucbald de Saint-Amand." *Revue du Nord* 69, no. 269 (1986): 511–529.

Pleszczyński, Andrzej. "Bolesław Chrobry konfratrem eremitów św. Romualda w Międzyrzeczu." *Kwartalnik Historyczny* 103, no. 1 (1996): 3–22.

———. "Początek rządów Bolesława Chrobrego." *Viae historicae*, 217–232.

———. "Sobiesław I Rex Ninivitarum. Książę czeski w walce z ordynariuszem praskim Meinhardem, biskupem Rzeszy." In *Monarchia w średniowieczu. Władza nad ludźmi, władza nad terytorium. Studia ofiarowane Profesorowi Henrykowi Samsonowiczowi*, edited by Jerzy Pysiak, Aneta Pieniądz-Skrzypczak, and Marcin Rafał Pauk, 125–138. Warszawa-Kraków: Towarzystwo Naukowe Societas Vistulana, 2002.

Poensgen, Aline. *Geschichtskonstruktionen des frühen Mittelalters zur Legitimierung kirchlicher Ansprüche in Metz, Reims und Trier*. Diss. Marburg-Lahn: Philippe-Universität, 1971.

Poirel, Dominique. "Le De rationali et ratione uti de Gerbert." In *Autour de Gerbert d'Aurillac*, 313–320.

Polen und Deutschland vor 1000 Jahren. Die Berliner Tagung über den „Akt von Gnesen". Michael Borgolte. Europa im Mittelalter. Abhandlungen und Beiträge zur historischen Komparatistik 5. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 2002.

Politik und Heiligenverehrung im Hochmittelalter, edited by Jürgen Petersohn. Vorträge und Forschungen 42. Sigmaringen: Thorbecke, 1994.

Polska na przełomie I i II tysiąclecia. Materiały Sesji Stowarzyszenia Historyków Sztuki. Poznań, listopad 2000, edited Szczęsny Skibiński. Poznań: Stowarzyszenie Historyków Sztuki, 2001.

Polska w świecie. Szkice z dziejów kultury polskie, edited by Jerzy Dowiat [et al.]. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1972.

Poppe, Andrzej. "Wokół chrztu Rusi." In *Narodziny średniowiecznej Europy*, edited by Henryk Samsonowicz, 212–230. Warszawa: Wiedza Powszechna, 1999.

Prinz, Friedrich. "Stadtrömisch-italische Märtyrerreliquien und fränkischer Reichsadel im Maas-Moselland." *Historisches Jahrbuch* 87 (1967): 1–25.

Prucnal, Dariusz. "Władca chrześcijański w Kronice Thietmara biskupa merseburskiego." *Roczniki Humanistyczne* 44, no. 2 (1996): 5–36.

Ramonat, Oliver. "Christianisierung und Endzeiterwartung." In *Europas Mitte um 1000*. Vol. 2, 792–798.

Rathsack, Mogens. *Die Fuldaer Fälschungen. Eine rechthistorische Analyse der päpstlichen Privilegien des Klosters Fulda von 751 bis ca. 1158*. Vols. 1–2. Päpste und Papsttum 24. Stuttgart: A. Hiersemann, 1989.

Rauh, Horst Dieter. *Das Bild des Antichrist im Mittelalter: von Tyconius zum deutschen Symbolismus.* Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie und Theologie des Mittelalters. Neue Folge 9. Münster: Aschendorff Verlag, 1973.

Remensnyder, Amy G. "Legendary Treasure at Conques: Reliquaries and Imaginative Memory." *Speculum* 71 (1996): 884–906.

Riché, Pierre. "Charles le Chauve et la culture de son temps." In *Jean Scot Erigène et l'Histoire de la Philosophie*. Colloques internationaux du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique 561, 37–46. Paris: Centre national de la recherche scientifique, 1977.

———. "Les écoles d'Auxerre au IXᵉ siècle." In *La chanson de geste et le mythe carolingien. Mélanges René Louis*. Vol. 1, 111–117. Saint-Père-sous-Vézelay: Musée archéologique régional, 1982.

Rokosz, Mieczysław. "Z ottońskiej propagandy kultu św. Wojciech (Jeszcze raz o rzymskiej fundacji na Wyspie Tybrowej." *Studia Warmińskie* 30 (1993): 45–60.

———. "Inter duos pontes. O ottońskiej fundacji ku czci św. Wojciecha na Wyspie Tybrowej." Analecta Cracoviensia 21–22 (1989/90): 505–525.

Roumailhac, Jean. "Dans la confession de l'abbaye Saint-Germain d'Auxerre: la disposition des corps saints autour de celui de Germain selon les Miracula sancti Germani d'Heiric." *Bulletin de la Société des Fouilles Archéologiques et des Monuments Historiques de l'Yonne* 2 (1985): 17–22.

Rudolf, Hans Ulrich. *Apostoli gentium. Studien zum Apostelepitheton unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des Winfried-Bonifatius und seiner Apostelbeinamen*. Diss. Tübingen. Göppinger akademische Beiträge, 42. Göppingen: A. Kümmerle, 1971.

Saint-Germain d'Auxerre. Intellectuels et artistes dans l'Europe Carolingienne. IXe–XIe siècles. Auxerre: Musée d'art et d'histoire, 1990.

Samsonowicz, Henryk. *'Długi wiek X'. Z dziejów powstawania Europy*. Mała biblioteka PTPN 8. Poznań: Poznańskie Towarzystwo Przyjaciół Nauk, 2002.

Sansterre, Jean-Marie. "Le monastère des Saints-Bonifaces-et-Alexis sur l'Aventin et l'expansion du christianisme dans le cadre de la 'Renovatio Imperii Romanorum'. Une revision." *Revue Bénédictine* 100 (1990): 493–506.

———. "Les coryphées des apôtres et la papauté dans les Vies des saints Nil et Barthélemy de Grottaferrata." *Byzantion* 55, no. 2 (1985): 516–542.

———. "Les justifications du culte des reliques dans le haut Moyen Age." In *Les reliques. Objets, cultes, symboles*, 81–93.

———. "Otton III et les saints ascètes de son temps." *Rivista di Storia della Chiesa in Italia* 43 (1989): 377–412.

———. "Recherches sur les ermites du Mont-Cassin et l'érémitisme dans l'hagiographie cassinienne." *Hagiographica* 2 (1995): 57–92.

Sapin, Christian. *La Bourgogne préromane. Construction, décor et fonction des édifices religieux*. Paris: Picard, 1986.

Sassier, Yves. "Les Carolingiens et Auxerre." In *L'école carolingienne d'Auxerre*, 21–36.

Sauerland, Heinrich Volbert. *Trierer Geschichtsquellen des XI. Jahrhunderts*. Trier: Paulinus-Druckerei, 1889.

Sawicki, Tomasz. "Badania przy kościele św. Jerzego w Gnieźnie." In *Gniezno w świetle ostatnich badań*, 163–186.

———. "Wczesnośredniowieczny zespół grodowy w Gnieźnie." In *Gniezno w świetle ostatnich badań*, 87–126.

Saxer, [V.]. [Comment] In *Segni e riti nella Chiesa altomedievale occidentale*. Vol. 2. Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo 33/II, 768. Spoleto: Presso la Sede del Centro, 1987.

Schäferdiek, Knut. "Kilian von Würzburg. Gestalt und Gestaltung eines Heiligen." In *Iconologia sacra*, 313–340.

Schaller, Hans Martin. "Zur Kreuzugsenzyklika Papst Sergius' IV." In *Papsttum, Kirche und Recht im Mittelalter. Festschrift für Horst Fuhrmann zum 65. Geburtstag*, edited by Hubert Mordek, 135–153. Tübingen: M. Niemeyer, 1991.

Schiebe, Friedrich-Carl. "Alcuin und die Admonitio generalis." *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters* 14 (1958): 221–229.

Schieffer, Rudolf. "Papsttum und Bistumsgründungen im Frankenreich." In *Studia in honorem Eminentissimi Cardinalis Alphonsi M. Stickler*, edited by Rosalio José Card. Castillo Lara. Studia et textus historiae iuris canonici 7, 517–528. Roma: LAS, 1992.

Schieffers, Heinrich. *Karls des Grossen Reliquienschatz und die Anfänge der Aachenfahrt.* Veröffentlichungen des Bischöflichen Diözesanarchivs Aachen 10. Aachen, 1951.

Schimmelpfennig, Bernhard. "Ein Bischof dem Papste gleich? Zu den Insignien und Vorrechten des Erzbischofs von Benevent." In *Aus Archiven und Bibliotheken. Festschrift Raymund Kottje*, edited by Hubert Mordek. Freiburger Beiträge zur mittelalterlichen Geschichte 3, 73–100. Franfurt-Berlin: Lang, 1992.

Schlesinger, Walter. *Kirchengeschichte Sachsens im Mittelalter.* Vol. 1. Mitteldeutsche Forschungen 27/I. Köln-Graz: Böhlau, 1962.

———. "Zur Geschichte der Magdeburger Königspfalz." In *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Erzbistums Magdeburg*, edited by Franz Schrader. Studien zur katholischen Bistums- und Klostergeschichte 11, 9–43. Leipzig: St. Benno Verlag, 1969.

Schmitt, Jean.-Claude. "Les reliques et les images." In *Les reliques. Objets, cultes, symboles*, 145–167.

Schneider, Wolfgang Christian. "Imperator Augustus und Christomimetes: Selbsbildnis Ottos III. in der Buchmalerei." In *Europas Mitte um 1000*. Vol. 2, 796–808.

Schnith, Karl. "Bayerische Geschichtsschreibung im Spätmittelalter. Eine Studie zu den Quellen von Passau- Kremsmünster." *Historisches Jahrbuch* 97/98 (1978): 194–212.

Schramm, Percy Ernst. "'Mitherrschaft im Himmel': Ein Topos des Herrscherkultes in christlicher Einkleidung (vom 4. Jahrhundert bis in das frühe Mittelalter)." (1st ed 1966). In *Kaiser, Könige und Päpste. Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Geschichte des Mittelalters*. Vol. 1. Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1968: 79–85.

———. *Die deutschen Kaiser und Könige in Bildern ihrer Zeit. 751–1190*, edited by Florentine Mütherich [et al.]. München: Prestel Verlag, 1983.

———. "Drei Nachträge zu den Metallbullen der karolingischen und sächsischen Kaiser." *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters* 24 (1968): 1–15.

———. "Kaiser, Basileus und Papst in der Zeit der Ottonen." *Historische Zeitschrift* 129 (1924): 424–475.

———. *Kaiser, Rom und Renovatio. Studien und Texte zur Geschichte des römischen Erneuerungsgedankens vom Ende des Karolingischen Reiches bis zum Investiturstreit.* Vols. 1–2. Studien der Bibliothek Warburg 17. Berlin: Teubner, 1929. Also vol.1 3d edition Bad Homburg vor der Höhe: Hermann Gentner Verlag, 1962.

Schreiner, Peter. "Die byzantinische Missionierung als politische Aufgabe: Das Beispiel der Slaven." In *Stephanos. Studia Byzantina ac Slavica Vladímiro Vavřínek ad annum sexagesimum quintum dedicata* (*Byzantinoslavica* 42), 525–533. Praha: Slovanský ústav. Euroslavica, 1995.

Schwineköper, Berent. "Die Regierungsantritt der Magdeburger Erzbischöfe." In *Festschrift für Friedrich Zahn*. Vol. 1, 182–238.

Seegrün, Wolfgang. "Das Papsttum und Skandinavien bis zur Vollendung der nordischen Kirchenorganisation (1164)." Quellen und Forschungen zur Geschichte Schleswig-Holsteins 51. Neumünster: K. Wachholtz, 1967.

Seeliger, Hans Reinhard. "Einhards römische Reliquien. Zur Übertragung der Heiligen Marzellinus und Petrus ins Frankenreich." *Römische Quartalschrift für christliche Altertumskunde und Kirchengeschichte* 83 (1988): 58–75.

Seibert, Hubertus. "Herrscher und Mönchtum im spätottonischen Reich." In *Otto III.—Heinrich II. eine Wende?*, 205–266.

Sikorski, Dariusz Andrzej. "Biskupstwa zakładane przez Anglosasów na kontynencie w VIII w.—aspekty prawne." In *Nihil superflluum esse*, 35–59.

———. "Jakie uprawnienia mieli cesarze do władania polskim Kościołem przed rokiem 1000? Na marginesie pewnej koncepcji Gerarda Labudy." *Czasopismo Prawno-Historyczne* 54, no. 1 (2002): 429–442.

———. *Kościół w Polsce za Mieszka I i Bolesława Chrobrego. Rozważania nad granicami poznania historycznego*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM, 2011.

———. "O zastosowaniu analogii powszechnodziejowych dla spraw polskich—replika na odpowiedź Romana Michałowskiego." *Kwartalnik Historyczny* 113, no. 2 (2006): 133–150.

———. "Zjazd Gnieźnieński widziany z perspektywy dziejów powszechnych." *Kwartalnik Historyczny* 112, no. 3 (2005): 135–160.

Skubiszewski, Piotr. "Ecclesia, Christianitas, Regnum et Sacerdotium dans l'art des Xe–XIe s. Idées et structures des images." *Cahiers de Civilisation Médiévale* 28 (1985): 136–152.

———. "Katedra w Polsce około roku 1000." In *Polska na przełomie I i II tysiąclecia*, 139–196.

———. *L'art du Haut Moyen Age. L'art européen du VIe au IXe siècle*. Baume-les-Dames: Librairie générale française, 1998.

Sokołowski, Marian. "Ołtarz główny pierwszej katedry gnieźnieńskiej." *Folia Historiae Artium* 1 (1964): 5–16.

Sot, Michel. "Arguments hagiographiques et historiographiques dans les 'Gesta episcoporum'." In *Hagiographie, cultures et sociétés. Actes du colloque organisé à Nanterre et à Paris (2–5 mai 1979)*, 96–104. Paris: Etudes augustiniennes, 1981.

———. *Gesta episcoporum, gesta abbatum*. Typologie des sources du Moyen Age 37. Turnhout: Brepols, 1981.

———. "Le Liber de episcopis Mettensibus dans l'histoire du genre 'Gesta episcoporum'." In *Paolo Diacono. Uno scrittore fra tradizione longobarda e rinovamento carolingio. Atti del Convegno Internazionale di Studi, Cividale del Friuli—Udine, 6–9 maggio 1999*, edited by Paolo Chiesa, 527–549. Udine: Forum, 2000.

———. "Le Mythe des origines romaines de Reims au xe siècle." In *Rome et les églises nationales, VIIe–XIIIe. Premier colloque du Groupe universitaire de recherches sur la christianisation de l'Europe occidentale. Tenu au Centre d'Etudes Historiques. Monastère de Malmedy, 2–3 juin 1988*, edited by Claude Carozzi and Philippe George, 55–74. Aix-en- Provence: Publications de l'Université de Provence, 1988.

———. "Mépris du monde et résistance du corps aux XIe et XIIe siècles." *Médiévales* 8 (1985): 6–17.

———. "Organisation de l'espace et historiographie épiscopale dans quelques cités de la Gaule carolingienne." In *Le métier d'historien au Moyen Age. Etudes sur l'historiographie médiévale*, edited by Bernard Guenée. Publication de la Sorbonne. Série 'Etudes' 13, 31–43. Paris: Université de Paris 1 Panthéon-Sorbonne. Centre de recherches sur l'histoire de l'Occident médiéval, 1977.

Spirito, Giuseppe de. "Silvestro II ed il Laterano o dell'epitafio di Gerberto d'Aurillac in relazione ad altri iscrizioni lateranensi." In *Gerberto d'Aurillac da Abate di Bobbio a Papa*, 727–777.

Staab, Franz. "Die Mainzer Kirche. Konzeption und Verwirklichung in der Bonifatius- und Theonesttradition." In *Die Salier und das Reich*, 31–77.

Staubach, Nikolaus. *Rex christianus. Hofkultur und Herrschaftspropaganda im Reich Karls des Kahlen. Teil II: Die Grundlegung der 'religion royale'*. Köln-Weimar-Wien: Böhlau, 1993.

Steinen, Wolfram von den. "Bernward von Hildesheim über sich selbst." *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters* 12 (1956): 331–362.

Stengel, Edmund E. "Die Grabschrift der ersten Äbtissin von Quedlinburg." *Deutsches Archiv für Geschichte des Mittelalters* 3 (1939): 361–370.

Strzelczyk, Jerzy. "'Diversi diverse sentiebant'. O właściwy obraz Ottona III." *Roczniki Historyczne* 64 (1998): 221–224.

———. *Apostołowie Europy*. Warszawa: Instytut Wydawniczy Pax, 1997.

———. *Bolesław Chrobry*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo WBP, 1999.

———. "Dwaj wybitni władcy w ujęciu porównawczym." *Przegląd Historyczny* 89, no. 3 (1998): 453–466.

———. "Gerbert z Aurillac—Sylwester II. Papież roku tysięcznego." *Życie i Myśl* 46, no. 4 (1999): 48–50.

———. *Iroszkoci w kulturze średniowiecznej Europy*. Warszawa: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy, 1987.

———. *Mieszko Pierwszy*, Poznań: Abos, 1992.

———. "Naukowe pokłosie millenium zjazdu gnieźnieńskiego." *Roczniki Historyczne* 68 (2002): 157–174.

———. "Naukowe pokłosie śmierci św. Wojciecha." *Nasza Przeszłość* 98 (2002): 5–97.

———. *Otton III*. Wrocław-Warszawa-Kraków: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 2000.

———. "Polen, Tschechen und Deutsche in ihren Wechselwirkungen um das Jahr 1000." In *Polen und Deutschland*, 43–59.

———. "Willigis z Moguncji." In *Memoriae amici et magistri*, 55–65.

———. *Zjazd Gnieźnieński*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo WBP, 2000.

Stumpf, Marcus. "Zum Quellenwert von Thangmars Vita Bernwardi." *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters* 53 (1997): 461–496.

Swinarski, Ursula. *Herrschen mit Heiligen. Kirchenbesuche, Pilgerfahrten und Heiligenverehrung früh- und hochmittelalterlicher Herrscher* (*ca. 500–1200*). Geist und Werk der Zeiten 78. Bern: Lang, 1991.

Swoboda, Wincenty. "Druga metropolia w Polsce czasów Bolesława Chrobrego." *Roczniki Historyczne* 63 (1997): 7–15.

Szághy, Marianne. "Aspects de la christianisation des Hongrois aux IXᵉ–Xᵉ siècles." In *Early Christianity in Central and East Europe*, 53–65.

Szczepański, Michał T. "Fundacja misyjna. Uwagi o kształtowaniu się ottońskiej koncepcji władzy." In *Monarchia w średniowieczu. Władza nad ludźmi, władza nad terytorium. Studia ofiarowane Profesorowi Henrykowi Samsonowiczowi*, edited by Jerzy Pysiak, Aneta Pieniądz-Skrzypczak, and Marcin Rafał Pauk, 229–250. Warszawa-Kraków: Towarzystwo Naukowe Societas Vistulana, 2002.

———. "Religijne powinności władcy w polityce Ottona I do 962 roku." *Kwartalnik Historyczny* 106, no. 3 (1999): 3–33.

Szymański, Józef. "Historiograficzne analogie Passawy i Krakowa z XIII wieku." In *Polska w Europie. Studia historyczne*, edited by Henryk Zins, 99–104. Lublin: Lubelski Oddział Polskiego Towarzystwa Historycznego, 1968.

Śmigiel, Kazimierz. "Gnieźnieńskie relikwie św. Wojciecha." In *Ecclesia Posnanensis. Opuscula Mariano Banaszak Septuagenario dedicate*, 39–45. Poznań: Uniwersytet im. Adama Mickiewicza w Poznaniu. Wydział Teologiczny, 1998.

Świechowski, Zygmunt. "Ottońska konfesja katedry gnieźnieńskiej." *Studia Źródłoznawcze* 14 (1969): 1–12.

Święty Wojciech w polskiej tradycji historiograficznej (1st ed. 1982), edited by Gerard Labuda. Warszawa: Instytut Wydawniczy Pax, 1997.

Święty Wojciech w tradycji i kulturze europejskiej, edited by Kazimierz Śmigiel. Gniezno: Gaudentinum, 1992.

Tabacco, Giovanni. "Privilegium amoris. Aspetti della spiritualità Romualdina." (1st ed. 1954). In Giovanni Tabacco, *Spiritualità e cultura nel Medioevo*, 167–194.

———. "Romualdo di Ravenna e gli inizi dell'eremitismo camaldolese." (1st ed. 1965). In *Spiritualità e cultura nel Medioevo*, 195–248.

———. *Spiritualità e cultura nel Medioevo. Dodici percorsi nei territori del potere e della fede*. Napoli: Liguori, 1993.

Taviani-Carozzi, Huguette. *La principauté lombarde de Salerne* (*IXᵉ–XIᵉ siècle*). *Pouvoir et société en Italie lombarde méridionale*. Vols. 1–2. Collection de l'Ecole Française de Rome 152. Rome: Ecole française, 1991.

Ter Braak, Menno. *Kaiser Otto III. Ideal und Praxis im frühen Mittelalter*. Amsterdam: Clausen, 1928.

Testi-Rasponi, Alessandro. "Archiepiscopus." *Archivum Latinitatis Medii Aevi* 3 (1927): 5–11.

Thomas, Heinz. "Erzbischof Siegfried I von Mainz und die Tradition seiner Kirche. Ein Beitrag zur Wahl Rudolfs von Rheinsfelden." *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters* 26 (1970): 368–399.

Tomaszek, Michał. "Brunon z Kwerfurtu i Otton II: powstanie słowiańskie 983 roku jako grzech cesarza." *Kwartalnik Historyczny* 109, no. 4 (2002): 5–23.

Tomaszewski, Andrzej. *Romańskie kościoły z emporami zachodnimi na obszarze Polski, Czech i Węgier*. Studia z historii sztuki 19. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 1974.

Toubert, Pierre. *Les structures du Latium médiéval. Le Latium méridional et la Sabina du IXe siècle à la fin du XIIe siècle*. Vols. 1–2. Bibliothèque des Ecoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome 221. Rome: École Française de Rome, 1973.

Trakt cesarski. Iława-Gniezno-Magdeburg, edited by Wojciech Dzieduszycki and Maciej Przybył. Bibliotheca Fontes Archaeologici Posnanienses 11. Poznań: Muzeum Archeologiczne w Poznaniu, 2002.

Trawkowski, Stanisław. "Die Eremiten in Polen am Anfang des 11. Jahrhunderts." In *Svatý Vojtěch, Čechové a Evropa: mezinárodní sympozium uspořádané Českou křesťanskou akademií a Historickým ústavem Akademie věd ČR 19.–20. listopadu 1997 v Praze*, edited by Dušan Třeštík and Josef Žemlička, 167–179. Praha: Naklad Lidové Noviny, 1997.

———. "Eschatologiczny aspekt biskupiej służby królowi w ujęciu Thietmara." In *Nihil superflluum esse*, 95–100.

———. "Pielgrzymka Ottona III do Gniezna. Ze studiów nad dewocją wczes-nośredniowieczną." In *Polska w świecie*, 107–124.

———. "Początki Kościoła w Polsce za panowania Mieszka I." In *Polska Mieszka I*, edited by Jan M. Piskorski, 51–72. Poznań: Ośrodek Wydawnictw Naukowych, 1993.

———. "Wokół początków arcybiskupstwa gnieźnieńskiego." In *Ludzie, Kościół, wierzenia*, 109–123.

Treffort, Cécile. "Le comte de Poitiers, duc d'Aquitaine, et l'Eglise aux alentours de l'an mil (970–1030)." *Cahiers de Civilisation Médiévale* 43 (2000): 395–445.

Třeštík, Dušan. "Grossmähren, Passau und die Ungarn um das Jahr 900. Zu den Zweifeln an der Authentizität des Briefes der bayerischen Bischöfe an den Papst Johann IX. Aus dem Jahr 900." *Byzantinoslavica* 59 (1999): 137–160.

———. "Von Svatopulk zu Bolesław Chrobry. Die Enstehung Mitteleuropas des Tatsächlichen und aus einer Idee." In *The Nieghbours of Poland in the 10th Century*, edited by Przemysław Urbańczyk, Warsaw: Institute of Archaeology and Ethnology Polish Academy of Sciences, 2000: 111–145.

Tropami świętego Wojciecha, edited by Zofia Kurnatowska. Poznańskie Towarzystwo Przyjaciół Nauk. Wydział Historii i Nauk Społecznych. Prace Komisji Archeologicznej 18. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Poznańskiego Towarzystwa Przyjaciół Nauk, 1999.

Tyszkiewicz, Jan. "Bruno of Querfurt and the resolutions of the Gniezno Convention of 1000. Facts and Problems." *Quaestiones Medii Aevi Novae* 5 (2000): 189–208.

———. "Brunon z Querfurtu i jego misje." In *Z dziejów średniowiecznej Europy Środkowo-Wschodniej. Zbiór studiów*, edited by Jan Tyszkiewicz. Fasciculi Historici Novi 2, 35–48. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo DiG, 1998.

———. "Brunon z Querfurtu na Rusi." In *E scientia et amicitia. Studia poświęcone Profesorowi Edwardowi Potkowskiemu w sześćdziesięciopięciolecie urodzin i czterdziesto-lecie pracy naukowej*, 219–227. Warszawa-Pułtusk: Wyższa Szkoła Humanistyczna, 1999.

———. "Misja z Polski w stepach u Pieczyngów. Kościół i państwo w czasach Bolesława Chrobrego." *Rocznik Tatarów Polskich* 4 (1997): 45–58.

———. Jurkowlaniec, Grażyna. *Zjazd gnieźnieński w 1000 roku. Utworzenie Kościoła i zapowiedź Królestwa Polskiego*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Sejmowe, 2000.

Uhlirz, Mathilde. *Otto III. 983–1002* (Karl Uhlirz and Mathilde Uhlirz, *Jahrbücher des Deutschen Reiches unter Otto II. und Otto III. 1*). Leipzig: Duncker and Humblot, 1954.

Ullmann, Wolfgang. "Magdeburg, das Konstantinopel des Nordens. Aspekte von Kaiser- und Papstpolitik bei der Gründung des Magdeburger Erzbistums." *Jahrbuch für die Geschichte Mittel- und Ostdeutschlands* 21 (1972): 1–44.

Urbańczyk, Przemysław. "Paliusz Gaudentego." In *Viae historicae*, 242–260.

———. "Zjazd Gnieźnieński w polityce imperialnej Ottona III." In *Trakt cesarski*, 49–90.

Verhelst, Daniel. "La préhistoire des conceptions d'Adson concernant l'Antichrist." *Recherches de Théologie Ancienne et Médiévale* 40 (1973): 52–103.

Viae historicae. Księga jubileuszowa dedykowana Profesorowi Lechowi A. Tyszkiewiczowi w siedemdziesiątą rocznicę urodzin. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wroclawskiego, 2001.

Vogel, Cyrille. "Les rites de la pénitence publique aux Xe et XIe siècles." In *Mélanges offerts à René Crozet*, edited by Pierre Gallais and Yves-Jean Riou, 137–144. Poitiers: Société d'études médiévales, 1966.

Voigt, Heinrich Gisbert. *Brun von Querfurt*. Stuttgart: J. F. Steinkopf, 1907.

Vones, Ludwig. "Erzbischof Bruno von Köln und seine „Schule". Einige kritische Betrachtungen." In *Köln—Stadt und Bistum in Kirche und Reich des Mittelalters. Fest. Odilo Engels*, edited by Hanna Vollrath and Stefan Weinfurter. Kölner Historische Abhandlungen 39, 125–137. Köln-Weimar-Wien: Böhlau, 1993.

Vuolo, Antonio. "Agiografia beneventana." In *Longobardia e longobardi nell'Italia meridionale. Atti del 2 Convegno internazionale di studi promosso dal Centro di*

Cultura dell'Universita Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, Benevento, 29–31 maggio 1992, edited by Giancarlo Andenna and Giorgio Picasso, 199–237. Milano: Vita e Pensiero, 1996.

Wagner, Anne. "Collection de reliques et pouvoir épiscopal au Xe siècle. L'exemple de l'évêque Thierry 1er de Metz." *Revue d'Histoire de l'Eglise de France* 83 (1997): 317–341.

Waldhoff, Stephan. "Der Kaiser in der Krise? Zum Verständnis von Thietmar IV, 48." *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters* 54 (1998): 23–54.

Wallace-Hadrill, John Michael. *The Frankish Church*. Oxford History of the Christian Church. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983.

Warner, David A. "Henry II at Magdeburg: kingship, ritual and the cult of saints." *Early Medieval Europe* 3 (1994): 135–166.

———. "Ideas and Action in the Reign of Otto III." *Journal of Medieval History* 25 (1999): 1–18.

Warnke, Charlotte. "Ursachen und Vorausetzungen der Schenkung Polens an den heiligen Petrus." In *Europa Slavica—Europa Orientalis. Festschrift für Herbert Ludat zum 70. Geburtstag*, edited by Klaus-Detlev Grothusen and Klaus Zernack. Osteuropa Studien der Hochschulen des Landes Hessen. Reihe I. Giessener Abhandlungen zur Agrar- und Wirtschaftforschung des Europäische Ostens 100, 127–177. Berlin: Duncker und Humblot, 1980.

Wasilewski, Tadeusz. "Czescy sufragani Bolesława Chrobrego a zagadnienia jego drugiej metropolii kościelnej." In *Społeczeństwo Polski średniowiecznej*. Vol. 5, 35–44. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1992.

———. "Pierwsze biskupstwo polskie z siedzibą w Poznaniu." In *Ludzie, Kościół, wierzenia*, 63–70.

———. "Zjazd Gnieźnieński w roku 1000 i jego znaczenie polityczne i kościelne." In *Osadnictwo i architektura ziem polskich*, 23–34.

Wattenbach, Wilhelm and Robert Holzmann. *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen im Mittelalter. Die Zeit der Sachsen und Salier*. Vol. 1, *Das Zeitalter des Ottonischen Staates (900–1050)*, edited by Franz-Josef Schmale. Weimar: Böhlau, 1967.

Wavra, Brigitte. *Salzburg und Hamburg. Erzbistumsgründung und Missionspolitik in karolingischer Zeit*. Osteuropa Studien der Hochschulen des Landes Hessen. Reihe I. Giessener Abhandlungen zur Agrar- und Wirtschaftsforschung des europäischen Ostens 179. Berlin: Duncker and Humblot, 1991.

Weiss, Anzelm. *Biskupstwa bezpośrednio zależne od Stolicy Apostolskiej w średniowiecznej Europie*. Katolicki Uniwersytet Lubelski. Wydział Teologiczny. Rozprawa habilitacyjna. Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw KUL, 1992.

———. "Pozwolenie na głoszenie Ewangelii (Licentia apostolica ad missionem) w czasach św. Wojciecha." *Universitas Gedanensis* 9, no. 1–2 (1997): 61–71.

———. "Rola i funkcja prowincji kościelnych w Kościele okresu starożytnego i wczesnego średniowiecza (do VIII w.)." *Roczniki Teologiczno-Kanoniczne* 28, no. 4 (1981): 29–51.

Wenskus, Reinhard. *Studien zur historisch-politischen Gedankenwelt Bruns von Querfurt.* Mitteldeutschen Forschungen 5. Münster-Köln: Böhlau, 1956.

Werner, Karl Ferdinand. "Der Autor der Vita sanctae Chrothildis. Ein Beitrag zur Idee der 'heiligen' Königin und des Römischen Reiches im X. Jahrhundert." *Mittellateinisches Jahrbuch* 24/25 (1991): 517–551.

———. "La légende de s. Alexis: un document sur la religion de la haute noblesse vers l'an Mil." In *Haut Moyen-Age, culture, éducation et société. Etudes offertes à Pierre Riché*, 531–546. Nanterre: Editions Publidix, 1990.

Wieczorek, Szymon. *Twórczość hagiograficzna Letalda z Micy na tle hagiografii francuskiej schyłku X i początku XI wieku.* Warszawa 2001 (typescript).

Willmes, Peter. *Der Herrscher-"Adventus" im Kloster des Frühmittelalters.* Münstersche Mittelalterschriften 22. München: W. Fink, 1976.

Wojciechowski, Leszek. "Symboliczne aspekty Zjazdu Gnieźnieńskiego." *Zeszyty Naukowe Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego* 43, no. 1–2 (2000): 13–24.

Wojciechowski, Zygmunt. *Patrycjat Bolesława Chrobrego* (1st ed. 1949). In Zygmunt Wojciechowski, *Studia historyczne*, 104–121. Warszawa: Pax, 1955.

Wojtecki, Dieter. "Slavica beim Annalisten von Quedlinburg." *Zeitschrift für Ostforschung* 30 (1981): 161–194.

Wolfram, Herwig. "Arn von Salzburg und Karl der Grosse." In *1200 Jahre Erzbistum Salzburg*, 21–32.

———. "Lateinische Herrschertitel im neunten und zehntnen Jahrhundert." In *Intitulatio.* Vol. 2, *Lateinische Herrscher- und Fürstentitel im neunten und zehntnen Jahrhundert*, edited by Herwig Wolfram. Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung, Ergänzungsband 24, 11–180. Wien-Köln-Graz: Böhlau, 1973.

———. *Salzburg, Bayern, Österreich. Die Conversio Bagoariorum et Carantanorum und die Quellen ihrer Zeit.* Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung, Ergänzungsband 31. Wien-München: Oldenbourg, 1995.

Wollasch, Joachim. "Das Patrimonium Beati Germani in Auxerre. Ein Beitrag zur Frage der bayrisch-westfränkischen Beziehungen in der Karolingerzeit." In *Studien und Vorarbeiten zur Geschichte des grossfränkischen und frühdeutschen Adels*, edited by Gerd Tellenbach. Forschungen zur oberrheinischen Landesgeschichte 4, 185–224. Freiburg im Breisgau: E. Albert, 1957.

Zeillinger, Kurt. "Otto III. und die Konstantinische Schenkung. Ein Beitrag zur Interpretation des Diploms Kaiser Ottos III. für Papst Silvester II. (DO III 389)."

In *Fälschungen im Mittelalter*, Vol. 2. MGH Schriften, 33/2, 506–536. Hannover: Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 1988.

Zeissberg, Heinrich. "Die öffentliche Meinung im 11. Jahrhundert über Deutschlands Politik gegen Polen." (1st ed. 1868). In *Heidenmission und Kreuzzugsgedanke in der deutschen Ostpolitik des Mittelalters*, edited by Helmut Beumann. Wege der Forschung 7, 1–21. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1973.

Zibermayr, Ignaz. *Noricum, Bayern und Österreich. Lorch als Hauptstadt und die Einführung des Christentums* (1st ed. 1944). Horn N.Ö.: Berger, 1956.

Ziemie polskie w X wieku i ich znaczenie w kształtowaniu się nowej mapy Europy, edited by Henryk Samsonowicz. Kraków: Universitas, 2000.

Zimmermann, Harald. "Der Streit um das Lütticher Bistum vom Jahre 920/921." *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung* 65 (1957): 15–52.

———. "Gerbert als kaiserlicher Rat." In *Gerberto: scienza, storia e mito*, 235–253.

Zöllner, Erich. "Die Lorcher Tradition im Wandel der Jahrhunderte." MIÖG 71 (1963): 221–236.

Zotz, Thomas. "Pallium et quaedam episcopatus insignia. Zum Beziehungsgefüge und zu Rangfragen der Reichskirchen im Spiegel der päpstlichen Privilegierung des 10. und 11. Jahrhunderts." In *Festschrift für Berent Schwineköper*, edited by Helmut Maurer and Hans Patze, 155–175. Sigmaringen: Thorbecke, 1982.

Index